THE
LIGHT OF TRUTH

— OR —

SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO

RELIGION, PHILOSOPHY, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, &c.,

VOL. II.

JUNE 1898—MAY 1899.

MADRAS.

PUBLISHED AT "THE SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA" OFFICE,
BLACK TOWN MADRAS FOR THE SUBSCRIBERS.
PRINTED AT THE C. N. PRESS BLACK TOWN MADRAS.

1899.

INDEX TO VOL. II.

TRANSLATIONS.

PAGES.

G.

Gleanings from Tamil Poets No. I. by N. B. 249
Do. No. II. do. 250

H.

Hymn from Devaram by N. B. 224

K.

Kaivalyopanishad by the EDITOR 199
Kaivalyopanishad by R. ANANTHAKRISTNA SASTRY, F. T. S. 201

S

Sivagnana Siddhiyar of Arul Nandi Siva Charyar, by J. M. NALLASWAMI PILLAI, B. A., B. L. 7, 33, 55, 104, 151, 176.

Sraddha and Bhakti 247

T.

Thayumanavar's Poems-God and the world by P. A. 9, 57
Thayumanavar's Poems by R. SHUNMUGA MUDALIAR. 11, 36, 82, 107, 128, 153, 177, 271
Tirumantra by Tirumular by the EDITOR 31, 80, 177
Thayumanavar's Poems by N. B. 222

V.

Vedanta-Sutras with Srikantha Bashya by A. MAHADEVA SASTRI, B. A., F. T. S ... 1, 25, 49, 73, 97, 121, 145, 169, 193, 217' 241, 265.

ARTICLES.

A.

Analogies in Gita by the EDITOR 85
Ancient Tamilian Civilization by the EDITOR... 109
Atyasramam by the EDITOR 208
Age of the different Bhashyams on the Vedanta Sutras by the EDITOR 215

C.

Cameos from Tamil Literature 41, 67
Correspondence G. BARTOLI 44

E.

Evidences of natural Religion by the Rev. G. BARTOLI, S. J. D. D. 18, 40, 65, 89, 134, 229, 279

G.

God and the World by the EDITOR. 37

J.

Justice Ranade on "South India." by the EDITOR 187

ARTICLES.—(*Continued.*)

PAGES.

K.

Kamban by T. Chelvakesavaraya Mudaliar, M. A.... ... ... 19, 42, 68, 91, 131
Kaivalya and Amirdabindu Upanishads by the Editor 181
Kalittokai Metres by T. Virabadra Mudaliar, B. A., B. L. 225
Kundalakesi and Valayapathy by N. B. 225

L.

Lord Sambandha and an unknown Tamilian Prosody by T. Virabadra Moodaliar, B. A., B. L. 114, 184

M.

Modern Oriental Scholarship by V. V. Ramanan, B. A., C. M. M. S. (London) &c. 159

N.

Notes by the Editor 203

O.

Obsolete Syllables நேர்பு and நிரைபு in Modern Venbas by T. Virabadra Mudaliar, B. A., B. L... ... 129
Our afflicted Brethren by the Editor... 155

P.

"Patriotism in the making of History" by the Editor 139
Poets of the Tamil Lands by the Rev. G. U. Pope, M. A. D. D. 140, 166
Prof. Fairbairn on the Philosophy of Religion by the Editor 214
Purra-Porul Venba Malai by the Rev. G. U. Pope, M. A. D. D. Oxford 227, 256, 273
Poetry of Stephen Phillips by V. V. Ramanan, B. A., C. M. M. S. (London) &c. 231
Prophets and their Mission by V. V. Ramanan, B. A., C. M. M. S. (London) &c. 277

S.

Some Aspects of the God-Head by the Editor 252
Segregation from the Hindu Stand Point by J. V. Ramaswami Naidu, L. M. & S. 263

T.

The Tamil Four Hundred Lyrics, Purra-Nannuru by the Rev. G. U. Pope M. A. D. D. Oxford 17
The Two Gems—(Sat and Satasat) by the Editor 61
The Theological Situation in India Do. 156

V.

Vowels and consonants (Mind and Body) by the Editor 13
Vaccination by Ancient Hindus by Lieutenant colonel W. G. King, M. D., D. P. H., I. M. S. &c. 261

W.

Week of great Promise by the Editor... 180

MISCELLANEA.

E.

Extracts... ... ... 70, 117, 190, 238, 284

N.

Notes and Comments... ... ... 23, 47, 71, 94, 119, 142, 210, 238, 263, 286

R.

Rviews 23, 45, 118, 165, 216, 228

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH
— OR —
SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.

***Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day,* 1897.**

VOL. II. } **MADRAS, JUNE 1898.** { **No. 1.**

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-SUTRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

Continued from page 270, *Vol. 1.*

Adhikarana–6.

As against this view, we hold that the A'nandamaya A'tman is the Parames'vara, because this A'nanda or bliss is repeatedly spoken of as unsurpassed. Beginning with 'there arises this enquiry as to A'nanda,'* the s'ruti speaks of several grades of bliss, ranging from human bliss to that of Prajapati, each higher grade being a hundred times superior to the one below it, and then concludes with "that is the unit of Brahman's bliss," thus declaring by repetition that Brahman's bliss stands unsurpassed at the head. The samsârin cannot be spoken of as such a repository of unsurpassed bliss.

As to the question how, if A'nandamaya be the Is'vara, to account for His prayer for purity,—the answer is as follows: Just as the highly lustrous moon attains clearness only on the disappearance of clouds which hide her, so, too, in the case of Him who is ever pure, purification consists in merely removing the *tirodhâna-mala*, the dirt which acts as the veil concealing Him from our view. Wherefore A'nandamaya is none other than Parames'vara.

(*Objection*) :—*A'nanda* itself is declared to be Brahman; and A'nandamaya must be an effect or emanation thereof, since the suffix 'maya' implies vikâra (change). If A'nandamaya were I's'vara, it would follow that I's'vara is different from Brahman. If, thus, I's'vara were a mere vikâra or effect, He would also be non-eternal.

The sûtrakâra states and answers the foregoing objection as follows:

If (you hold it is) not so because of the word (implying) vikara, (we hold you are) not (right), because (it implies) abundance.—(I. i. 14).

(*Objection*) :—Just as Annamaya and others are the vikâras or modified forms of *anna* or food, etc., so also *A'nandamaya* is a vikâra or modified form of ananda. For instance, a jar or the like which is formed of clay is only a modified form of clay.

* Tait. Upanishad 2—8.

Accordingly since Parames'vara cannot be a vikâra, A'nandamaya is none other than Jîva.

(*Answer*) :—No, because here the suffix 'maya' implies abundance. Only in the words 'annamaya,' 'prânamaya,' 'and manomaya,' '*maya*' means vikâra or modified form. Vijñânamaya is the Jivâ in whom Vijñâna or intellection is in abundance; A'nandamaya is Parames'vara in whom A'nanda or bliss abounds.

(*Objection*) :—As occurring in a section dealing with vikâras or modified forms, it is altogether but proper that the suffix 'maya' should be taken to mean vikârr.

In answer, the Sûtrakâra says:

Also because of the mention of a reason therefor.—(I. i. 15.)

The passage "He alone verily causes bliss"* declares A'nandamaya as the cause of bliss with reference to Jîvas. He alone who himself abounds in bliss can impart bliss to others. Wherefore A'nandamaya is none other than Parames'vara.

Objection :—Though it has been said that A'nandamaya is the Parames'vara in whom bliss is abundant, still, it will be found that He is quite distinct from brahman; for, the words "Brahman is the tail, the basis"† show that He has Brahman for His basis. If it be admitted that Brahman is distinct from the Parames'vara, the former becomes a dependent being and cannot, therefore, be the cause of the universe, and so on. Wherefore it is better to hold that Jîva is meant here.

In reply the Sûtrakâra says:

And the very subject of the hymn is sung here.—(I. i. 16).

The very Brahman spoken in the words of the Mantra, "Truth, Wisdom, and Endless is Brahman"‡ is described as A'nandamaya in the passage "Another inner âtman is A'nandamaya,"§ as abounding in bliss. In the passage Brahman is the tail, the basis, the word "Brahman" designates Pranava, which as the designation of Parames'vara, forms His basis

On this subject some hold as follows:—

It is the *Paramâkâs'a* or Supreme Light, the *Prakriti A'tman*, that is spoken of in the S'ruti as A'nandamaya; but not the Para-Brahman, that Cause which is beyond the Universe and described, as "Truth, Wisdom, and Endless is Brahman." A'nandamaya is the *Paramâkâs'a* described as the Prakriti or the material cause of the universe including akâs'a or ether, as stated in the passage "From this A'tman, verily, was akâs'a produced."* That the A'tman here spoken of is of the form of Paramâkâs'a is seen from the passage "If this akâs'a, the A'nanda, did not exist &c." † And the passage "Brahman is the tail, the basis" ‡ shows that Brahman is the basis of A'nanda-âkâs'a. Accordingly in the passage "That is the unit of Brahman's bliss" we find that the A'nanda rests in Brahman. This very A'nanda is again described as the prakriti of all beings in passages like.

"He knew that A'nanda is Brahman, it is from A'nanda verily are all these beings born." §

And A'nanda is here spoken of as Brahman in the words "A'nanda is Brahman," because as an attribute of Brahman is is not quite distinct from Brahman. The passage "This wisdom of Bhrigu and Varuna is based on the Paramâkâs'a declares that Varuna's wisdom concludes with Paramâkâs'a, which is an attribute of Brahman, and which is of the nature of Supreme Bliss, the prakriti or material cause of the universe, otherwise known as the Supreme energy, the self-conscious A'tman. Wherefore it is the Supreme energy (Parama-sakti)—which is an attribute of Brahman, the A'tman which is the Prakriti or the material cause, the Supreme Light (Paramâkâs'a), that is spoken of as A'nandamaya. As the substance possessing A'nandamaya as an attribute, the Supreme Brahman is spoken of as its basis. And Vijñânamaya is the Jîva, the worshipper thereof. The Sûtrakâra has introduced the Sûtra 13, thinking that the A'nandamaya-A'tman is one with Brahman, because the former, the A'nandamaya, which is of the nature of an attribute (dharma) and energy (Sakti) cannot be thought of as distinct from the latter, the Para-Brahman, the basic substance wherein it inheres as an attribute and energy.

Others, again, hold as follows: these five A'tman, spoken of as *annamaya* and so on, are no doubt the five sentient Purushas or spiritual entities on the causal plane of being, designated as Brahmâ, Vishnu, Rudra, I's'âna and Sadâs'iva and who are the impelling controllers of the five bhûtas or cosmic elements hinted at by *anna* (food) etc., inasmuch as in such passa-

* Tait. Upanishad 2—7.
† Tait. Upanishad 2—5.
‡ Tait. Up. 2-1.
§ Tait. Up. 2-5.

* Tait. Upanishad 2-1.
† Tait. Upanishad 2-7. Tait. Upanishad 2-5.
‡ Tait. Upanishad 3-6.
§ Tait. Up. 3-6.

ges as "from this world departing, he becomes united with the physical (*annamaya*) A'tman"* the 'annamaya' and others occur in connection with 'A'tman which denotes a sentient being, and are described as reachable one after another by the liberated soul departing from this world of samsâra. The Brahman who is known as Paramas'iva and who is the cause even of Sadâs'iva, *i. e.*, of the *A'nandamaya* who is the basis of the Annamaya and other A'tmans,—is spoken of as His (Sadâsiva's) basis. The A'nandamaya is not regarded as distinct from Brahman and is therefore spoken of as Brahman. Thus, all things considered, it may be concluded that A'nandamaya is Parames'vara.

Adhikarana—7.

It has been established that the definition—arrived at by an accordant construction of the scriptural texts—of Brahman, the Supreme S'iva, as the cause of the Universe, is not too wide as applying to Pradhâna and Jîva as well. Next the Sûtrakâra proceeds to discuss the passages which seem to declare that Hiranyagarbha, who is made up of the totality of Jîvas is the cause of the Universe.

Not the other, because of incongruity. (I. i. 17).

The following passage of the Mahopanishad forms the subject of discussion here:

"Whence proceeded the birth of the Universe, (That Being) by water sent forth the (bodies of) souls on earth, and (it was that Being) which by plants, entered into men and beasts, into all beings moving and unmoving."†

The doubt arises as to whether the Purusha spoken of as the cause of the birth etc. of the whole Universe is the Parames' vara or some one else.

Pûrvapaksha:—It is the Hiranyagarbha, because of His characteristic marks described here.

From the puranic passage:

"The three lokas having become one ocean, the Brahman in the form of Nârâyana reclines on the serpent-bed, expanded by the devouring of the three worlds."

we learn that Brahmâ lies in the ocean. This characteristic mark of His is found described in the passage: "Whom within the ocean the sages weave."‡

*Tait. Upanishad 3-10.

†Mahana. Up. 1.

‡ *i.e.* whom the sages see forming himself the whole Universe, as threads form themselves a cloth.

In the opening passage of the whole section "Prajapati moves in the womb within" * He is described as having entered into all beings, and in the conclusion the passage "the creator made the sun and the moon as before, also heaven and the earth" † declares that He is the cause. Wherefore it is but right that to the Hiranyagarbha who is thus referred to in the opening and concluding passages apply all the attributes described in the intervening passages. Moreover, reference has been made to the following passages which treat of Hiranyagarbha:

"He was born of waters &c."
"Hiranyagarbha at first was &c."

In the section first referred to here, it is certainly Prajâpati that is treated of; for, we find it said that "Prajâpati moves in the womb within; the unborn is born in many a form." In the section next referred to, it is said that "Prajâpati is verily the Hiranyagarbha." Therefore it is verily the Hiranyagarbha who is described here as the cause of the birth of the world and so on.

As against the foregoing view we hold as follows: It is not the Hiranyagarbha as distinct from the Parames'vara, that is treated of here; for, the attributes of Parames'vara—such as being the cause of the origin of the Universe—cannot apply to the Hiranyagarbha. The Being spoken of at the beginning as the cause of the Universe, as the being "whence proceeded the birth of the Universe" is described to be higher than all and far transcending the darkness or the region of Prakriti, in the verses beginning with the following:—

"There is verily none else higher and subtler than This which is higher than the high and greater than the great; which is one, unmanifest, of endless forms, the whole universe, the ancient, beyond the darkness." ‡

This cannot apply to the Hiranyagarbha who is within the Mundane Egg. Moreover, moksha or immortality is said to result from a knowledge of Him, in the words.

"They who know Him become immortal." §

This, too, cannot refer to Hiranyagarbha, for, as a special distinguishing mark of Parames'vara, it is

* Mahana. Up. 1.

† Tait. Aranyaka 3-13.

‡ Mahana. Up. 1.

§ Mahânârâyana. Up. 1.

declared that He is the source of immortality in the following passage.

"When like leather men can fold ether, then alone without knowing S'iva there can be an end of pain." *

It is of no use to say that He (the Hiranyagarbha) is referred to in the opening and concluding passages. As inapplicable to Hiranyagarbha, the words "Prajâpati" and "Dhâtâ," denote the Parames'vara who is literally the Lord of creatures and the supporter of the Universe. In both the sections referred to—Taittiriya A'ranyaka 3-13 and Taittiriya Samhita 4-1-8—it is the Parames'vara Himself that is spoken of, because of His characteristic attributes—that He is the Lord of the Universe and far beyond it—described thus:

"Who rules this, the two-footed and the four-footed"† "The sun-coloured, beyond the darkness." ‡

Wherefore He who is spoken of as Prajâpati and the cause of the world is the Parame'svara, not the Hiranyagarbha.

As against the view that the Hiranyagarbha is the cause of the Universe since there is no distinction between Him and Parames'vara, the Sûtrakâra says:

And because of the mention of a distinction. (I. i. 18).

A distinction between Parames'vara and Hiranyagarbha as cause and effect, is made in this Mahopanishad in the following passage:—

"The Rudra, the Great Sage (Maharshi) transcending the Universe, first saw Hiranyagarbha, the first of the Devas then being born." §

Wherefore it may be concluded that the I'svara is the cause of the whole Universe including Hiranyagarbha.

The Sûtrakâra refutes another possible objection thus:

And in spite of his desire, no ground for inference. (I. i. 19).

Everywhere in the Sruti Hiranyagarbha's desire concerning the creation of the Universe is spoken of in the words "Prajapati desired, may I produce the creatures," still, there is no ground for the inference that he is the cause of the universe, for his desire concerns itself with the minor creation. Even this minor creation pertains to the Parames'vara Himself who takes the form of Hiranyagarbha as the Sûtrakâra will say in the Sûtra II. iv. 20.

The Sûtrâkara now proceeds to consider the view that the identity of Parames'vara and Hiranyagarbha should be admitted inasmuch as it is declared in the passage.

"Entering in the form of this Jîva, the Atman, the name and form will I differentiate,"* that Parames'vara who has entered into the universe as its soul in the form of Hiranyagarbha is the creator of names and forms.

And herein (it) declares his relation to Him (I. i. 20).

Herein, in the science of this very Upanishad, the mantric texts declare the Hiranyagarbha's subordinate relation to Parames'vara, in the words "Brahman is the Lord, the Lord of Brahmâ"†. Wherefore, it follows that none but Parames'vara is the cause of the universe and that the Hiranyagarbha is subordinate to Him.

Adhikarana—8.

By means of arguments adduced in the foregoing adhikaranas it has been established that Para-Brahman is the Being called Siva who is distinct from *chit* and *achit*, spirit and matter; who is omniscient, ever-contented, of beginningless wisdom, independent of never-failing power, of infinite potentialities, the two-fold cause of the whole universe; who can be revealed only by the one accordant interpretation of the whole science of the Upanishad; who, by nature is without a second, self-luminous, and conjoined with the whole Universe; who is the existence, Intelligence and Bliss in essence; who constitutes the means by which to cut asunder the bond of samsâra. The next adhikarana proceeds to point out that form of His on which to concentrate the mind and which constitutes for the aspirant an antidote for samsâra

(He who is) within is Paramesvara because of the declaration of His attributes. (I. i. 21).

The following passage in the Chhândogya forms the subject of discussion here:

"Now that Golden Person, who is seen within the sun, with golden beard and golden hair, golden altogether to the very tips of his nails, whose two eyes are like white lotus."‡

* S'vetâs'vatara Up. 6-2.
i. e. There can be no end of pain without a knowledge of Siva.
† Tait. Sam. 4-1-8.
‡ Tait. âranyaka. 3-13.
§ Mahânârâyana. Up. 12.

* Chhandogya-Up. 6—3.
† Mahana. Up. 21.
‡ Chh. Upanishad 1-6.

The doubt arises as to whether this golden person within the sun is Parames'vara or any particular Devatâ.

Now, Parames'vara who is the basis of all and who is everywhere, cannot be the person who is within the sun and of golden form. If it be held to be the form assumed by Him of His own accord, it must necessarily be the form containing three eyes. Such a form is not found here : we find described here only two eyes which are like blue lotus's.

Or, even if it were the body assumed of his own accord, it would certainly produce pain even in the case of Parames'vara as much as in the case of samsârins. Even in the case of a voluntary contact, it is in the very nature of fire to burn the thing in contact. Thus it is not proper to suppose that Parames'vara becomes united to a body. Wherefore the person (spoken of in the passage under discussion) is some Devatâ, not the Parames'vara. This is the argument that may be adduced on behalf of the *Pûrvapaksha.*

The *Siddhânta* maintains that it is the Parames'vara Himself —Why so ?— Because of the mention of his attributes. In the passages " He is the master of all worlds and of all desires " and " His name is the ' Above', He has risen above all sins " * it is the attributes of Parames'vara, the attributes of sinlessness and of mastery over all worlds and desires, are spoken of ; for, it is revealed that

> " One indeed is Rudra,—they are never for a second,—who rules these worlds by His ruling energies."†

> " The One who to many ordains the objects of desire." ‡ and so on.

As to the contention that He who is the basis of all and who pervades all cannot be a dweller within the sun, we reply that the Parames'vara who is the basis of all and who pervades all things assumes some golden form in consideration of the devotees and dwells in the solar orb. Unlike us, by such a connection with the body the Is'vara does not become subject to the evil of samsâra. The blessed s'ruti itself declares both his connection with the body and his freedom from all sin. In fact, dependant as we are on the authority of s'ruti, we do not hold analogical reasoning very high. Even fire cannot burn those things in contact which are too powerful. The mention of two eyes of the three-eyed Parames'vara is meant merely to show its resemblance to white lotus : it does not mean the absence of a third eye. When we say, for instance, of a man having three sons, that two of his sons are like fire, the mention of the number 'two' does not imply the absence of the third, but it is meant to show the resemblance of the two sons to fire. So also here. Two of Parames'vara's eyes shine like the white lotus which has been blossomed by the sun, whereas the third eye, which is naturally closed, does not resemble the fully-blossomed lotus ; it is like a closed lotus.

(*Objection :*) In the following passage,

" This Being who moves, the Dark-necked (Nilagriva) and Red, whom the cowherds and the water-carrying women have seen, and whom all beings see, He, when seen, makes us happy." *

we are given to understand that the dark-necked Parames'vara is visible to all beings. And from another passage " The three-eyed sun who by his splendour has pervaded the orb on all sides" we learn that he possesses three eyes. Therefore A'ditya Himself is the Parames'vara visible to all and residing in the middle of the shining orb. Otherwise, how can the Sruti speak of the sun as dark-necked and three-eyed or designate Him a Brahman in the words " This sun is Brahman" ? † Wherefore it is the very Sun-god residing in the orb, spoken of as he " who is within the sun," that is referred to as the golden purusha or spirit.

Against this view the Sûtrakâra says:—

And because of the mention of a distinction, He is another. (I.i.22.)

The Parames'vara of golden form is quite distinct from that sentient A'ditya, the personal soul of the solar orb, because of the distinction made in the s'ruti.

Who dwelling in the sun, inner than the sun, whom the sun knows not, whose body the sun is, who within controls the sun,—he is thy A'tman, the Inner Regulator (Antaryâmin), the Immortal."‡

Here the word " immortal" denotes S'iva, because it is said in the Jâbâla-Upanishad in praise of S'atarudrîya that " these verily are the designations of the Immortal." § From the attribute—described of Para-

* Chh. Upanishad 1—6.
† S'vetâ Upanishad 3—2.
‡ S'vet. Upanishad 6—13.

* Tait. Samhitâ 4-5-1.
† Tait. Aranyaka 2-2.
‡ Br. Upanishad 5-7.
§ Jâbâla. Up. 3.

mes'vara—that He is unknown to the sun, we should understand that the Parames'vara is distinct from the Jîva. Wherefore it is the Parames'vara dwelling within the sun, the golden Is'vara,—it is the Parames'vara as distinguished from the sentient sun that is spoken of here as "dark-necked, blood-red."* As the indwelling soul of the sun, he is spoken of by the sun.

(*Objection*:) The "dark-necked" dwelling within the sun is not the Parames'vara; on the other hand He is Nârâyana. Accordingly the lay poets, everywhere, declare:—

"To be always meditated upon is He, Nârâyana, who, dwelling within the sun's orb, is seated on the lotus-seat."

He alone can properly be said to have two eyes like the white lotus, because He is well-known as "the Pundarikâksha or the lotus-eyed." Why all the trouble of explaining it otherwise?

(*Answer*) :—No ; because the special characteristic marks of the Parame'svara which are found described in connection with the Golden Spirit (Hiranmaya Purusha), cannot be explained when applied to Nârâyana. Now it is proper to determine the drift of this passage of doubtful signification,—referred to in the Sûtra,—by collating it with other passages which admit of no doubt.

In the Mahopanishad there is the following passage:—

"It is verily the sun (âditya) that burns this orb, etc." †

Here the sun, the personal soul dwelling in the orb, is spoken of in the words "the person who is in this shining orb"; then the Golden Spirit, the Regulator within the sun, is referred to in the words

* Tait. Samhita 4-5-1.
† Maha. Up. 13-14.

"This Golden spirit who is within the sun." *; then again His vibhûti (glory) as the sun is spoken of in the words "The sun is the vigor, energy, strength and fame." *; then he is referred to as the Lord of all beings in the words "He is the Spirit, the Lord of all Beings." * then again in answer as it were to the question who He is, He is again described in the section which begins with "All is Rudra..." * and concludes thus: "to Him who is Golden-armed the Golden-Lord, the Lord of Ambikâ (the mother), the Lord of Umâ." † As the mention of 'arm' in this description stands for other features as well, we should understand that it means the golden-coloured. Therefore it follows that it is He whose colour is like gold, who is the Lord of Umâ, that is spoken of as the one dwelling within the sun. Here His characteristic marks are: He is Nîlagrîva or dark-necked, He is the Lord of Umâ. These cannot be ascribed to any being other than the Parames'vara. The possession of eyes like lotus is a general mark, applicable to other beings besides Nârâyana. We speak of a woman or a man having eyes like lotus. When the two marks are mentioned together, the special mark should prevail in our determining of the exact being spoken of here. The passage cited above to show that Nârâyana should always be meditated upon as the deity dwelling within the sun should be understood in a figurative sense. Wherefore it follows that the Being who has to be meditated upon as dwelling in the sun by seekers of Moksha is none but the Blessed Parames'vara, described in the Sâvitrî or Gáyatrî-Hymn—of golden form, having three eyes, dark-necked, the Lord of Umâ, the Lord of all regions and all desires, untouched by any evil whatsoever.

A. MAHA'DEVA S'A'STRI, B. A.

(*To be continued*).

* Maha. Up. 23.
† Mahana. Upanishad 18.

SIVAGNANA SIDDHIAR OF ARUL NANDI SIVA CHARIAR.

(Continued from page 272, Vol. I.)

Prapakaran's Statement.

1. We will state to the world wherein Prapakara differs from Bhattacharya in the exposition of the Doctrines held by that austere ascetic Jaimini Bagavan from a diligent study of the Vedas.

2. Such a thing as *Apurva* arises after a man has performed austere sacrifices, and it (Apurva) again produces fruits, (in the next birth) after its past Karma has been performed by the body in conjunction with the intelligent Soul. When the Soul has attained to a condition of freedom from all action and results, and remains quiet like a block of earth or stone, then it is that the soul has attained Mukti. This is his statement.

His Refutation.

1. The Vedas assert that it is the past Karma that produces fruits and you now set up against the authority of the Vedas some new thing as *Apurva*. If the fruits are not the result of the past Karma but derived newly from *Apurva*, then we may assert that the flowers of the sky acquired their fragrance, after they were worn on the head.

2. The Vedas speak of *Ananda* in Mukti, and what you state therefore is erroneous that cessation of intelligence and action is *Mukti.* As well could you say that the man in a swoon is in *Mukti*. Fire deprived of its redness (heat) loses its identity. Your assertion that the soul can subsist in Mukti after it loses its intelligence cannot be admitted by us.

Sabda Brahmavadi's Statement.

1. It is *Sabda* (sound) which is delusively understood as the Universe. The substance postulated by the ignorant, (as different from sound) is a mere myth. The right understanding of this doctrine is real Mukti. So says the Sabda Brahmavadi, without a proper study of the nature of the Universe.

2. This delusive perception is caused by the differentiation and increase (*Parinama of Sabda*); and this results in the seen Universe. As such the only real entity is *Sabda*. What is called the substance (meaning) is merely the product of *Sabda*. If you assert otherwise, then no substance does exist without sound (name).

3. In two such words 'பூ and மா' meaning respectively flower and Lakshmi at one time and earth and animal at another time, the words (sound) remain the same though the meanings differ. As such it is the words (Sabda) that we lovingly utter that contains the concept meaning different things. This is similar to rice becoming fried rice.

4. It is after we utter a word, we become conscious of the substance; as such, understand that the word (sound) is the only real substance. If you say that the word and its meaning are related together conjointly, then, even when you give the meaning, it is a word.

His Refutation.

1. If you say the Universe was formed by the delusive differentiation of *Sabda*, then you had better admit also as a substance this delusive differentiation. If believing in *Sabda* as a reality is itself *Mukti*, then you conflict in this matter with the express teaching of the Vedas which insist upon the performance of rites and the attainment of knowledge as the means of salvation.

2. As the Sabda is formless, it could not think of attaining forms when becoming the Universe. If you compare this change to the change of milk into curds, then curds could not become milk and the world could not be reduced back to *sound*, and your *Sabda* (sound) will perish.

3. When you predicate change (by *Parinama* and *Vivarthana*) of *Sabda* you must admit at the same time that Sabda is perishable, as the substanee indicated by sound is everywhere, the words (sound) become merely the symbols of the things when we wish to know them.

4. You said that the substance has no form except from sound. and that therefore sound is the real substance. The word (sound) அரி has two meanings

2. The Prapakara sets up a new postulate calling it *Apurva* to explain the Karma being undergone in one's life time, and he does not try to explain it as the effect of past Karma. Apurva means something which did not exist before. The explanation is as much no explanation at all, and naming such notion is like explaining the effects of opium by saying that it is due to its somnulent power.

3. Says a commentator "If the thing is the Parinama of sound, then when we utter the name 'fire,' fire must be produced. If the thing is *Vivarthana* then when we utter the name fire, our tongues must be scorched." As such the thing cannot be derived from *Sabda* by either mode. The word is a mere symbol or mark (இடுகுறிப்பெயர்), by which we have learnt to call the thing.

'Vishnu' and 'monkey.' Then can you say that Vishnu is monkey if sound be the real substance?

5. Rice requires fire to become fried rice (so the analogy is fallacious). As a number of meanings is united in a word, the learning to know the meanings is knowledge of *Sabda*; and real knowledge consists in learning to know the distinct *Padarthas* (things). As such the knowledge of things (substance) is of greater importance than the knowledge of Sabda.

6. The name indicates the thing we have already perceived or about to perceive. As such the substance is really the thing perceived and not the name (sound). Where did you learn to say that Sabda is substance and not the thing.

7. Perception (knowledge) of a thing is induced when the soul is in conjunction with the internal and external senses and their cause (Prakriti) and the thing perceived and the light of God. In such a perception or knowledge there is no name but only the thing or substance.

1. As a lamp lights the things lying in darkness, so *Sabda* is an instrument or aid for understanding the substance. The Sabda is not eternal; it will perish. This Sabda was produced by the Almighty God and as such the Sabda cannot be God.

NOTES.

As thus explained and exposed, it might be thought that the system deserves very little consideration, that this represents an effete and obsolete system. But the fallacies inherent in this system are so deep-rooted that they can be detected in many a subtle reasoning to-day. Many of the word-juggles existing in the Vedanta philosophy can be traced to the influence of this system, such as the myth of the *Nama Rupa Prapancha*, as illustrated by the simile of the sea and the wave and the foam and in many an other argument. The names or sounds are themselves taken for things and hence the confusion in thought. It is forgotten that a name is 'merely a mark attached to a thing to enable it to be spoken about,' and that there may be knowledge without language and things without names. Says Dr. Bain, "The knowledge that guides the lower animals is unconnected with language. They observe by their senses the things about them; and the observations are remembered in sensible forms. The bush that gives shelter, the herbage for food, the animals to be preyed upon, are known and sought after, by the sole guidance of sense impressions."

"Human beings have numerous experiences of the same kind involving the order of nature, without being connected with words. The child has a large stock of sense-knowledge before it can understand and employ language. The skill of the artizan consists, for the largest part, in associations between sensible appearances and movements; to the stone polisher the sight of the surface at once suggests the next blow. Even in a highly intellectual profession, as the practice of Physic, the consummation of skill requires a large sense knowledge passing beyond the scope of language. The physician learns from books, everything that can be expressed in words; but there are delicate shades of diagnosis that no language can convey, stored up without verbal expression, in the eye, the ear and the touch." "And there are numerous sources of error, pitfals and snares in the use of names, and mostly in the abuse of abstract names, which is exemplified in the almost irresistible tendency they have to suggest the existence of things in the abstract." The other branch of the Sadba Brahmavadis, believe in the Vedic mantra (sound) as all powerful and that no higher power like God is at all necessary to explain the existence and origin of the Universe and that *Sabda* is itself God. There are believers in the Veda like Jaimini and his pupils and in the efficacy of Vedic rites and ceremonies, and yet who believed in no God. Among the modern day brahmins, many may be found who strictly adhere to the belief that the Vedic mantra alone is all powerful and *Siddhis* &c. can be acquired by the power of the mantra without belief in God. The phrase 'Mantric Power' embodies the fallacy of the whole system, as opposed to Divine Power. Consider the following quotation from Barth, "Sacrifice is only an act of preparation, it is the best of acts, but it is an act and its fruits consequently perishable. Accordingly although whole sections of these treatises (Upanishads) are taken up exclusively with speculations on the rites, what they teach may be summed up in the words of the Mundaka Upanishad, 'Know the Atman only and away with everything else; it alone in the bridge of immortality.' The Veda itself and the whole circle of sacred science are quite as sweepingly consigned to the second place. The Veda is not the true Brahm; it is only its reflexion. And the science of this imperfect Brahm, this *Sabda Brahm* or Brahm in words only is a science of a lower order. The true science is that which has the true Brahm, the Para Brahm for its subject." The Rishis of *Tarukavana* were votaries of the *Sabda*

Brahm and they believed that they could effect their salvation by the Vedic Mantra alone and thought, like Indra and Agni of old noticed in the Kena Upanishad that they acquired all their powers by their own will and independent of the Divine help, and became thoroughly filled with Egoism (Ahankara). This Ahankara had to be destroyed. Their power and sanctity had to be put to the test. Their power was so frail that their sanctity left them the moment they and their wives saw the form of *Mohini* and *Bitchadana*. Then they tried their powers to destroy these Beings. The Veda is often symbolised by the deer, மான்மறை chiefly as the sound uttered by it is supposed to resemble the Vedic chant and the Rishis created a gigantic deer and sent it out to kill Siva. It raised such a tremendous bleat as to reach the uttermost regions and yet it affected not the Supreme; and the One took it in its hands and held it quite close to its ear. This allegory truly illustrates the principle that however loud we may shout out the name of God, we cannot reach him and know him, unless we do it in all love and in all spirit. One other remark and we close our notes. In regard to Bhattacharya's system, that the Veda is unrevealed (*Swayambu*) it will be interesting to note that of the present day Hindu systems, except Saivism, all the other schools hold to this doctrine and Saivism alone believes in the Veda as revealed and God as the revealer. If other schools, hold that the Veda is not revealed, it is because the Beings they believe in are not expressly mentioned in the Veda itself as the revealer or they have not ascended to the true idea of God as the revealer of all knowledge out of His Infinite Grace. In any view, it cannot be true that the Veda was self-caused. It must either have an human author or a Divine author and it can only be an euphemism to call it *Swayambu*.

J. M. NALLASWAMI PILLAI, B. A., B. L.

(To be continued).

TAYUMANAVAR.

GOD AND THE WORLD.

This poem of the Saint Tâyumânavar, remarkable alike for beauty of ideas and of setting, and to which no translation can do justice, describes (as far as words can) God, the only reality, and by contrast the World, with its "lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life," clinging to the pleasures of the senses as heaven and as real, only to find its mistake when in the throes of death and to learn too late that God is the only help and should have been the only goal. Not that the Saint altogether condemns sensuous enjoyments. He has elsewhere explained in what spirit they should be enjoyed.

கொந்தவிழ்மலர்ச்சோலை நன்னீழல்வைகினுங்
குளிர்தீம்புனற்கையள்ளிக்
கொள்ளுகினுமந்நீ ரிடைத்திளைத்தாடினுங்
குளிர்சந்தவாடைமடவார்
வந்துலவுகின்றதென முன்றிலிடையுலவவே
வசதிபெறுபோதும்வெள்ளை
வட்டமதிபட்டப் பகற்போலநிலவுதர
மகிழ்போதும்வேலையமுதம்
விந்தைபெறவறுசுவையில் வந்ததெனவமுதுண்ணும்
வேளையிலுமாலைகந்தம்
வெள்ளிலைய டைக்காய் விரும்பிவேண் டியவண்ணம்
விளையாடிவிழிதுயிலினுஞ்
சந்ததமுநின்னருளை மறவாவரந்தந்து
தமியேனைரக்ஷைபுரிவாய்
சர்வபரிபூரண வகண்டதத்துவமான
சச்சிதானந்தசிவமே. (க)

"Whether in grateful shade I dwell of groves
Rich in clustered blooms, or cool sweet draughts
I quaff from limpid stream,
Or in its waters bathe and sport,
Or, fanned by fragrant breezes fresh that
Like maidens in the court yard play,
I revel in the full moon's day-like splendour,
Or on dainties I feast wherein ocean's ambrosia
Haply hath wondrous entered, or in garlands,
Perfumes, betel, I joy, or rest in sleep,—
Thy Grace may I never forget! This boon
Unto me grant and from the world guard me,
O Sivam, all-pervading, infinite, true,
That art the Only Reality, Pure Knowledge, Bliss!"

வண்ணம்.

அருவென் பனவுமன்றி உருவென் பனவுமன்றி
அகமும் புறமுமன்றிமுறைபிறழாது
குறியுங் குணமுமன்றி நிறைவுங் குறைவுமன்றி
மறையொன் றெனவிளம்பவிமலமதாகி
அசலம் பெறவுயர்ந்து விபுலம் பெறவளர்ந்து
சபலஞ் சபலமென்றுளறிவினர்காண
ஞானவெளியிடைமேவுமுயிராய்— (ஞ)

அனலொன் றிடவெரிந்து புகைமண் டிடுவதன்று
புனலொன்றிடவமிழ்ந்துமடிவிலதாதை
சருவும் பொழுதுயர்ந்து சலனம் படுவதன்று
சமர்கொண்டழிவதன்றோரியல்பினதாகும்
அவனென் பதுவுமன்றி அவளென் பதுவுமன்றி
அதுவென்பதுவுமன்றியெழில்கொடுலாவும்
ஆருநிலையறியாதபடியே— (வ)

இருளென் பதுவுமன்றி யொளியென் பதுவுமன்றி
எவையுந்தனுளடங்கவொருமுதலாகும்
உளதென் பதுவுமன்றி யிலதென் பதுவுமன்றி
உலகந் தொழவிருந்த வயன்முதலோர்கள்
எவருங் கவலைகொண்டு சமயங் களில்விழுந்து
சுழலும் பொழுதிரங்கி யருள்செயுமாறு
கூறரியசகமாயையறவே— (வளு)

எனதென் பதையிகழ்ந்த வறிவின் றிரளினின்று
மறிவொன் றெனவிளங்குமுபயமதாக
அறியுந் தரமுமன்று பிறியுந் தரமுமன்று
அசரஞ் சரமிரண்டி னொருபடியாகி
எதுசந் ததநிறைந்த தெதுசிந் தனையிறந்த
தெதுமங் களசுபங்கொள்சுகவடிவாகும்
யாதுபரமதைநாடியறிநீ. (௬)

பருவங் குலவுகின்ற மடமங் கையர் தொடங்கு
கபடந் தனில்விழுந்து கெடுநினைவாகி
வலையின் புடைமறிந்த மறியென் றவசமுண்டு
வசனந் திரமுமின்றியவரிதழூறல்
பருகுந் தொழிலிணங்கி யிரவும் பகலுமின்சொல்
பகரும் படிதுணிந்து குழலழகாக
மாலைவகைபலசூடியுடனே— (௬ளு)

பதுமந் தனையிசைந்த முலையென் றதையுகந்து
வரிவண் டெனவுழன்றுகலிலெனவாடுஞ்
சிறுகிண் கிணிசிலம்பு புனைதண் டைகண்முழங்கும்
ஒலிநன் றெனமகிழ்ந்து செவிகொளநாசி
பசுமஞ் சளின்வியந்த மணமுந் திடமுகந்து
பவமிஞ் சிடவிறைஞ்சி வரிசையினூடு
காலின்மிசைமுடிசூடிமயலாய்— (ஜ)

மருளுந் தெருளும்வந்து கதியென் பதைமறந்து
மதனன் சலதிபொங்க விரணமதான
அளிபுண் டனைவளைந்து விரல்கொண் டுறவளைந்து
சுரதஞ் சுகமிதென்றுபரவசமாகி
மருவுந் தொழின்மிகுந்து தினமுந் தினமும்விஞ்சி
வளரும் பிறைகுறைந்தபடிமதிசோர
வானரமதெனமேனிதிரையாய்— (ஜளு)

வயதும் படவெழுந்து பிணியுந் திமிதிமென்று
வரவுஞ் செயலழிந்துளிருமலுமாகி
அனமுஞ் செலுதலின்றி விழியுஞ் சுடர்களின்று
முகமுங் களைகளின்றுசரியெனநாடி
மனையின் புறவிருந்த வினமுங் குலைகுலைந்து
கலகஞ் செயவிருண்டயமன்வரும்வேளை
எதுதுணைபழிகாரமனமே. (க)

Not form nor formless, not in, not out,
swerving not from order,
Not mark nor quality, fulness nor defect,
declared by the Vedas to be One, pure,
Rising aloft, spreading forth majestic,
seen inwardly by the wise
To be gain, pure gain,
Life pervading Spirit-Space
Not to be burned by fire nor whelmed by smoke,
drowned in water nor raised
Nor moved by force of wind, nor
killed in battle; of nature ever one;
Not he, not she, not it,
walking in beauty, understood by none;
Not darkness nor light; all-embracing substance,
not being nor not-being;
Piercing in pity the Mâyâ-universe,*
gracious to help what time
Brahma and others the world adores
are tossed in care;
In intelligences rid of 'I' and 'Mine' standing,
yet as One Intelligence shining,
Not to be known as two, not to be sundered,
the same in lifeless and living things;
What is That which is ever full,
which is dead to thought, which is pure Bliss and [Peace?
What is the Supreme?
Seek thou THAT and know.

In lovely woman's wiles fallen,
on evil thoughts intent,
Caught like deer in toils,
of speech unsteady,
Ever sipping her lips, drinking
sweet prattle night and day,
Decking her locks with varied wreaths,
to lotus-buds her breasts likening, on them doting,
In the tinkle of her anklets delighting,
that like bees make music and dance around,
Her sweet perfume enjoying,
worshipping her to thy ruin,
Crowning thy head with her feet,
with delusion and darkness seized,
Forgetting thy goal,
Cupid's sea overflowing,
Rubbing the ripe sore with the finger,
saying "This is bliss, This is bliss,"
Mad acts of passion growing, intellect
daily waning like the waning moon,
Body growing grey like an ape's,
years advancing,
Diseases in hosts tramping,
coughing, coughing,
Limbs not moving, food not eating,
eyes lacking light, face lacking lustre,
Kinsfolk in hot haste arriving
and making uproar "It is all up, all up,"
Thus when dread Death comes,
who will help thee, O Mind, you sinner?

P. A.

* i. e. The Absolute becoming conditioned and manifest.

TAYUMANAVAR'S POEMS.

(*Continued from page 276, Vol. I.*)

எங்குநிறைகின்றபொருள்.

காகமானதுகோடி கூடிநின்றாலுமொரு
கல்லின்முன்னெதிர்நிற்குமோ
கர்மமானதுகோடி முன்னேசெய்தாலுநின்
கருணைப்ரவாகவருளைத்
தாகமாய்நாடினரை வாதிக்கவல்லதோ
தமியனேற்கருட்டாகமோ
சற்றுமிலையென்பதவும் வெளியாச்சுவினையெலாஞ்
சங்கேதமாய்க்கூடியே
தேகமானதைமிகவும் வாட்டுதேதுன்பங்கள்
சேராமலியோகமார்க்க
சித்தியோவரவில்லை சகசநிட்டைக்குமென்
சிந்தைக்கும்வெகுதூரநா
னேகமாய்நின்னோ டிருக்குநாளெந்நா
ளிந்நாளின்முற்றுறுதோ
யிகபரமிரண்டிலு முயிரினுக்குயிராகி
யெங்குநிறைகின்றபொருளே. (கச)

94. O Thou All-filling Intelligence, the Soul of souls both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions!

Though innumerable crows are flocked together in a place, yet in a single pelting with a stone, they are all made to disappear at once. Likewise, the immense accumulations of Thy devotees' past *karma* must completely dwindle away if they should feel an unremitting thirst for Thy Boundless Grace.*

So I have to determine that I have not yet entertained a vehement taste for Thy Heavenly Grace: The gathered effects of *my* past karma do, as well, harass me and I am unable to free myself from the wordly tumults and remain fixed in yoga of peaceful concentration of mind. My heart is still very much unsuited to the true meditation of Divine Bliss.

O for that day, my Lord, on which I will be *one with Thee* in blessed *advaita* union.

ஒருமைமனதாகியே யல்லறநின்னருளி
லொருவனுன்வந்திருக்கி
னுலகம்பொருததோ மாயாவிசித்ரமென
வோயுமோவிடமில்லையோ
வருளுடையநின்னன்பர் சங்கைசெய்திடுவரோ
வலதுகிர்த்தியகர்த்தரா
யகிலம்படைத்தெய்மை யாள்கின்றபேர்சில
ரடாதென்பரோவகன்ற
பெருமைபெறுபூரணங் குறையுமோபூதங்கள்
பேய்க்கோலமாய்விதண்டை
பேசுமோவலததான பரிபாககாலம்
பிறக்கவில்லையோதொல்லையா
மிருமைசெறிசடவினை யெதிர்த்துவாய்பேசு
மோ வேதுளவுசிறிதுபுகலா
யிகபரமிரண்டிலு முயிரினுக்குயிராகி
யெங்குநிறைகின்றபொருளே. (கரு)

95. O Thou All-filling Intelligence, the Soul of souls both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions! What will it matter to Thee if Thou would let me, a single soul,* also seek Thy Blessed Grace and, with oneness of mind, be in Thy Happy contemplation? Cannot the ethereal region † sustain me? Or will the phenomena ‡ of *maya* disappear with me, having no

* The Saint points out in this verse the extremest difficulty of procuring God's Grace and Its supremest power solely to destroy our *Karmic* effects.

* The Saint alludes to the existence of an infinite number of souls and the Moksha state of a soul being. c. f. also Thiruvarutpayan chapter II. 1st couplet "பிறந்தநாள் மேலும் பிறக்குநாள் போலுந் துறந்தோர் துறப் பொர்துகை." (The number of liberated souls and of those yet to be liberated will equal the number of days that are past since this creation and of the days that are yet to come; *i. e.*, their number is endless). It is practically impossible to conceive or talk of God *alone* except in connection with plurality of souls, or *jivas*, or *logos*, or *atmas*, by whatever name we call them. "The knowers of Brahman dub, shadow and light." Section III (1) Katha Upa. c. f. "Though all individual souls came from the Over-Soul (God), yet It (God) remains undiminished." The Peace Chant:—"Om! Whole is *That*, Whole is *this*; from whole, whole cometh; take whole from whole, (yet) whole remains. Om; Peace! Peace! Peace! Harih! Om!"—Isha. Upa. c. f. Mr. Subba Row's discourses on the Bhagavad Gita, p. 9. edition of 1888. "It (Logos) has consciousness and an individuality of its own. I may as well say that it is the only *personal God*, perhaps, *that* exists in the cosmos. But *not to cause any misunderstanding*, I must also state that such *centres* of energy are almost *innumerable in the bosom of Parabrahmam.* It must *not* be supposed that this *Logos* is but a *single* centre of energy which is manifested by Parabrahmam. There are *innumerable* others. *Their number is almost infinite.*"

† *ethereal* intelligence—perfect in the ethereal region which occupies everywhere and is occupied by Supreme Parabrahmam or Siva with no contradiction to conceive of. In as much as we see it as a fact that liquid permeates the solid, gas the liquid, air the gas, ether the air; so the Parabrahmam (Sukshmachit) permeates the souls (Sthulachits) as well as the ether. Hence the Parabrahmam is called The Great Akas (c.f. "O! The Great Akas where the ether rests"—23rd verse *supra*).

‡ Here the Saint refers to the distinct entity of the illusory and changeable matter called *maya* or nature or Prakriti. The maya is as a fact ever controlled by the Parama-Siva and made to serve for Him as the material cause (pradhâna) with which to give *Thanu* (body)—*Karana* (senses)—*Bhuvana* (world) and *bhôga* (sensations) *for souls to undergo evolution towards spiritualization. c. f.* Sivagnana Siddhiar "காரிய காரணங்கண் முதறுணை நிமித்தங் கண்டாம், பாரின் மண்டிரி கைபண்ணும் அவன் முதறுணை நிமித்தம், தேரின் மண்மாயையாகத் திரிகை தன் சத்தியாக, ஆரியன் குலாலனாய்நின் றாக்குவ னகிலமெல்லாம்" *i. e.*,—We see that causes are always threefold to effect a thing like a pot. For instance, *God* being the (1) First Cause (Potter) wills the whole world (pot) to come into a manifested existence out of (2) the material cause, *sudda* and *asudda* maya (mud) by the aid of (3) the Instrumental Cause, *His own Arul sakti* (potter's wheel).

We see that our Saint in this verse (95) points out the *co-existence* of the *Three Padarthas*, *Pathi* (Lord), *Pasu* (souls including, of course the muktas, devas *Brahma* &c.), and *Pasa* (maya or matter) and does, indirectly, reveal the possibility of such *co-existence* without any contradictions. For, there is not wanting the *unity* of ABSOLUTE LORDSHIP or control or government of the eternal Supreme Siva-Lord of *subjective nature, over the individual souls* and *maya*, both which being of *objective nature* are ever inseparable with and subordinate to Him either in *bhanda* or *moksha* states; and *they* can never affect His Omnipresence or Omniscience or Omnipotence &c. He has such *power* and *nature*. Who is to question it? When a soul becomes a mukta it assumes its subjective nature so far as pasa (matter) is concerned only. Even in its *moksha* state with pathi (Lord), the soul's nature is objective only.

other work to do? Or will Thy beloved *muktas* raise any objection to it? Or will the Trinity gods who have to create and preserve the universe counsel against it? Will Thy great ubiquity be affected by it in any way? Or will the elements counterplead against Thee in a malignant spirit? Have I not yet reached the equality of my good and bad qualities? And consequently will my good *Karma* and bad *Karma* be bold to countermand your Supreme Will?

O Benefactor, let me know the real secret of it.

நில்லாத தேகமென நினைவுண்டு தேகநிலை
நின்றிடவு மௌனியாகி
நேரேயுபாய மொன்றருளினையே யோவிதனை
நின்றனுட்டிக்கவென் றாற்
கல்லாத மனமோ வொடுங்கியுபரதிபெறக்
காணவிலை யாகையாலே
கையேற்றுணும் புசிப் பொவ்வாதெநாளுமுன்
காட்சியிலிருந்து கொண்டு
வல்லாளராயியம நியமாதிமேற்கொண்ட
மாதவர்க்கேவல்செய்து
மனதின்படிக்கெலாஞ்சித்திபெறலாஞானம்
வாய்க்குமொருமனுவெனக்கிங்
கில்லாமையொன்றினையு மில்லாமையாகவே
யிப்போதிரங்குகண்டா
யிகபரமிரண்டினிலு முயிரினுக்குயிராகி
யெங்குநிறைகின்றபொருளே. (௯௬)

96. O Thou All-filling intelligence, the Soul of souls both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions!

I know, indeed, the fleeting character of my physical body. Thou as *mauni* didst reveal to me the artifice of preserving it in tact for ever. And should I think of practising this artifice, I could not befit myself to it by controlling my mind which tends always to concern itself in the *prapancha*.* I should no more, therefore, addict myself to the mundane habit of food-taking. But I must endeavour to place myself at the service of Thy austere devotees, who, resting themselves in Thy Holy Presence, keep self-controlled always in the Siva-Raja-Yoga of eight parts, † *yama, niyama* &c. And I will, then, be able to merit myself with the desired *siddhis* ‡ and the Supreme Sivagnana.§

Hence, O The Supreme, do Thou at once grant me the only thing I am in need of:—*Thy unbounded Grace of Blessedness.*

மரவுரியுடுத்துமலை வனநெற்கொறித்துமுதிர்
வனசருகுவாயில்வந்தால்
வன்பசிதவிர்த்துமனல் வெயிலாதிமழையால்
வருந்தியும்மூலவனலைச்
சிரமளவெழுப்பியு நீரினிடைமூழ்கியுந்
தேசநமதல்லவென்று
சிற்சுகவபேக்ஷையாய் நின்னன்பர்யோகஞ்
செலுத்தினரியாம்பாவியேம்
விரவுமறுசுவையினொடு வேண்டுவபுசித்தரையி
ல் வேண்டுவவெலாமுடுத்தி
மேடைமாளிகையாதி வீட்டினிடைவைகியே
வேறொருவருத்தமின்றி
யிரவுபகலேழையர்கள் சையோகமாயினே
மெப்படிபிழைப்பதுரையா
யிகபரமிரண்டினிலு முயிரினுக்குயிராகி
யெங்குநிறைகின்றபொருளே. (௯௭)

97. O Thou All-filling Intelligence, the Soul of souls both in their *bhanda* and *moksha* conditions!

Thy devotees in the forest who bathe themselves in water and sit in Thy blessed contemplation, arousing upwards their innermost fire, would use barks of trees for their coverings and get their pain of hunger allayed by nibbling the wild-grown rice or with whatever dry leaves they might come across, and also undergo severe hardships through inclemency of weather such as heat and rain.

But, alas! we, the helpless, out of ignorance, *simply* yield ourselves to the pleasures of the best nourishment of six tastes * and of fanciful dresses and clothing and of the *sex*, enriching ourselves with storied *palatia* where day and night are seldom felt and *poverty* does make no appearance.

O God, how can we, except by Thy worship, get over these *incidental* luxuries † of this life?

R, SHANMUGA MUDALIAR.

(*To be continued*).

* Prapañcha=world.

† Vide 'Ashtanga yoga' under 61st verse.

‡ *i.e.*, powers.

§ c. f. 36th verse *supra*.

* The 6 tastes are:—(1) கைப்பு or கசப்பு (bitterness), (2) தித்திப்பு (sweetness), (3) புளிப்பு (sourness), (4) உவர்ப்பு (Saltishness), (5) துவர்ப்பு (astringency), and (6) கார்ப்பு (pungency). These six tastes when combined in a fixed proportion produce best deliciousness for man.

† *Incidental luxuries of this life.* The Saint points to the fallacy of misunderstanding the truth 'அவனன்றி யோரணுவு மசையாது' (Not an atom moveth but by Him) to the effect that even our evil acts are ascribable to the Perfectest Lord. According to the Saiva Siddhanta School, each soul has its own consciousness and a moral responsibility, and it cannot shift itself from such responsibility by blindly attributing every one of its acts (including the diabolical murder) to God and escaping under the above saying 'not an atom moveth but by Him' misconstrued as above. Just as, in pursuing the Siva Rajah Yoga, though the eight siddhis or powers incidentally arise, still the Yogi is warned and enjoined not to indulge himself in them and lead himself astray from the Highest Goal to be aimed at; so also in the course of incarnation or evolution of souls, which is indispensable for their attainment of *mukti* the evils thereof due to this *pasa* world (*maya prapancha*) are incidental and must not be permitted by them to over-come their moral faculty and retard their acquirement of the Divine Gnana. For, otherwise, our life will end in the miseries of a boatman, who, instead of rowing it, out of sportive mischief, bores the bottom of it, c. f. 89th verse *supra*.

THE

LIGHT OF TRUTH

OR

Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, JUNE 1898.

VOWELS AND CONSONANTS.

[MIND AND BODY.]

" Of letters, the letter A, I am," Gita.

" There is an alliance with matter, with the object or extended world ; but the thing allied, the mind proper, has itself no extension and cannot be joined in local union. Now, we have a difficulty in providing *any form of language, any familiar analogy,* suited to this unique conjunction ; in comparison with all ordinary unions, it is a *paradox* or *contradiction* "—Bain.

The quotation we give above is from Dr. Bain's remarkable book 'Mind and Body,' and the several chapters comprising the book are worth close study even though we are not bound to accept the learned Doctor's conclusions and share in his hope that the philosophy of the future will be a sort of qualified materialism. The important thing is to get at his facts, as far as they can be arrived at by close observation and experiment and such inference as are warranted by strict logic, which have been most thoroughly sifted and about which therefore there can be no doubt. We will enquire therefore what are the proved facts concerning the nature of mind and body and their characteristics and the nature of their connection so far as they can be ascertained. Now as regards mind, it is analysed into Feelings (including emotions), Will and Intellect. "These are a trinity in unity ; they are characteristic in their several manifestations, yet so dependent among themselves that no one could subsist alone ; neither Will nor Intellect could be present in the absence of Feeling ; and Feeling manifested in its completeness carries with it the germs of the two others." The ultimate analysis of a Feeling being either a pleasure or a pain, it is seen, however, that volition or thought could not in any sense be confounded with Feelings. What Dr. Bain however means in the above quotation is that without the acquisition of feelings, no volition or thought could arise first, that feelings are primarily all derived through the sensory organs and centres. And a pleasure is seen to be connected with an activity which tends to promote life (உயிர்க்கிதம் செய்தல்) and a pain, to destroy life (உயிர்க்கஷ்டம்செய்தல்) which determine also in ethics, the nature of right (good) and wrong, *Papam* and *Punyam*. This principle is stated as the law of self-conservation. But there is a limit to all pleasures ; and even a pleasure may become painful, if only carried to excess. Another law exhibited in feelings, which applies also to thought is what is called the law of relativity, namely that "change of impression is necessary to our being conscious." Either a feeling or a thought only too long prolonged bocomes feeble and feeble till it is blotted out altogether and we are no more conscious of such feeling or thought ; and to become conscious again we soon change this train, and then revert. The Tamil philosophers state this principle in the axiom 'நினைப்புண்டேல், மறப்புண்டாம்,' 'If there is thought there is forgetfulness also.' Dr. Bain almost confesses that both on the mental and physical side, the reason for this exhibition of this law is not very explicable. But Hindu philosophers take this fact as showing that man's intelligence (அறிவு) is weak (சிற்றறிவு) and it can become stronger and stronger and become all thought by practice (Sadana). In Yogic practice, what comes first is more darkness, oblivion than light but continuing in the same path, there dawns true light in the last resort, and (the nature of the light is so often mistaken in the interval so many shades of it breaking out.) And our volition (இச்சை-Ichcha) determines our actions as impelled by Feeling or Intellect. Intellect is analysed into a sense of difference and sense of similarity and Retentiveness or Memory. What are called variously as memory, reason, judgment, imagination, conception and others are all resolvable into these three kinds. And difference lies at the very basis of our intellect. No knowledge and no intellectual operation is possible, if there is no difference in the constituent elements, if there is a mere sameness. If there was only one colour, the art of painting will be an impossibility ; if there was only one sound or tune, music we could never hear. As it is, the law of relativity governs our very being. Sameness could give knowledge, only if there was difference and hence the sense of similarity is also accounted an intellectual function ; and a great function it performs in the field of invention. And no high degree of intellectual

power is possible if we do not possess the power of remembering our past experiences and impressions. And one peculiarity of the human mind, may we call it a defect, may be also noted here, as based on the law of relativity already stated. The mind is not conscious of all the impressions through all the sense organs all at once. A man does not become conscious of a sight, a touch, a sound, or a smell all at once. There must be a transition from one to the other however momentary it might be. And the case of an *Ashtavadani* is no exception to this. Assisted by a good memory, the more *avadanams* he performs the more time does he take. It will be noted that in this analysis of mind, no distinction is drawn between a feeling and a consciousness of a feeling, a volition and a consciousness of a volition, a reasoning and the consciousness of reasoning. Both are taken to be identical and therefore needing no distinction. In Hindu philosophy, they are distinguished, and a mere feeling or willing or thinking is separated from consciousness of such functions, and the pure consciousness is taken as the soul or Sat, and the rest classed with body and the world as non-soul or Asat (other than Sat). And we will speak of this distinction more further on. From these mental functions however are contrasted the body and its functions and the so-called external world. This collectively called matter or the non-ego or the object possess certain characteristics and properties which are not found in mind at all, such as breadth and length (order in place, extension hardness and softness (inertia), weight (gravity) colour, heat, light, electricity, organised properties chemical properties &c., &c., and the most important of this is *extension* Matter is *extended*, Mind is *unextended*. Says Dr. Bain,

"We are in this fix : mental states and bodily states are utterly contrasted ; they cannot be compared, they have nothing in common except the most general of all attributes—degree, order in time; when engaged with one we must be oblivious of all that distinguishes the other. When I am studying a brain and nerve communications, I am engrossed with properties exclusively belonging to the object or material world, I am unable at that moment (except by very rapid transitions or alterations) to conceive a truly mental consciousness. Our mental experience, our feelings and thought have *no extension*. No place, no form or outline, no mechanical division of parts; and we are incapable of attending to anything mental until we shut off the view of all that. Walking in the country in spring, our mind is occupied with the foliage, the bloom, and the grassy meads—all purely objective things. We are suddenly and strongly arrested by the odour of the May-blossom; we give way for a moment to the sensation of sweetness ; for that moment the objective regards cease ; we think of nothing extended ; we are in a state where extension has no footing; there is to us place no longer. Such states are of short duration, merefits, glimpses ; they are constantly shifted and alternated with object states, and while they last and have their full power, we are in a different world ; the material world is blotted out, eclipsed, for the instant unthinkable. These subject-movements are studied to advantage in bursts of intense pleasure or intense pain, in fit of engrossed reflection, especially reflection on mental facts ; but they are seldom sustained in purity, beyond a very short interval ; we are constantly returning to the object side of things—to the world whose basis is extension and place."

However widely these may differ, there is this remarkable fact about them that they are found united together in a sentient being—man or animal. And the exact correlation, correspondence or concomitance in these two sets of phenomena is what Dr. Bain takes very great trouble to show in several chapters. This we need not deny as Dr. Bain fully admits that this conjunction and correspondence do not warrant us in stating that mind causes body or body causes mind ; but his position is that mind-body causes mind-body. There is a duality in the very final resort and ultimate analysis but a disembodied mind cannot be thought of and he uses various expressions such as, an 'undivided twin' a 'double faced unity,' 'one substance with two sets of properties.' &c. And we don't see why Dr. Bain should ally himself with materialists if he is not going to call this *one substance* not as matter altogether but as only matter-mind or mind-matter ; unless it be that he is unable to prove himself the existence of mind except in conjunction with an organized body. This latter circumstance again causes no difficulty to the Siddhanti who postulates 'முத்தியிலும் மும்முதலுண்டு,' 'Even in Mukti, none of the three *padarthas* are destroyed,' and who no more believes in a disembodied mind than Dr. Bain, unless a body or an organism be taken to be the body composed of all the 25 lower tatwas. From the table given in No. 10, of the first volume of this magazine, it will be seen that even the most spiritual beings have a body composed of Asudda or Sudda Maya and we have also remarked, cautioning against the common mistake of calling matter dead, that these higher aspects of matter are so potent and active as to be often mistaken for God Himself. Passing from this point however, we now come to the question as to the nature of the union between this mind and body. And when we talk of union, the suggestion that it is *union in place* that is most predominant. And Dr. Bain lays great stress on the fact that such a local conjunction is not to be thought of, is impossible. There can be no union in place between an unextended thing (as

Chit) and an extended thing (as Achit); and all such expressions external and internal, container and contained are also misleading and mischievous. The connection is not a causal connection. It is wrong to call such conjunction as one acting on the other, or as one using the other as an instrument. (The theory of occasional causes and of pre-established harmony are also antiquated now. The phenomenon is a most unique one in nature; there is no single similar conjunction in nature, so that we may compare it by analogy and there is no fitting language to express such conjunction either. The only adequate expression to denote a transition from an object cognition to a subject one is a *change of state*. Language fails, analogy fails, to explain this union though in itself a fact; and it remains a mystery in a sense, though to seek an explanation for an ultimate fact can in no sense be logical; and all that we can do has been done when we have tried to generalize the various sets of phenomena into the fewest possible number and if we cannot pass to a higher generalization than two, we can only rest and be thankful.

We are sure that this is a perfectly safe position to hold and our object in penning this article is in no way to differ from this view; only we fancy, we have an *analogy* in Tamil, which will exactly answer the point and make the union more intelligible, besides bringing out the nature of mind and matter, in a much more favourable light, than from the stand point of a mere materialist, qualified or otherwise; and we fancy we have been almost every day using language to describe this union, though the name in itself is a *puzzle*, and embodies both a *paradox* and a *contradiction*. Before we state them however we will state one or two facts so far as they bear upon the relation of mind and matter, and which Dr. Bain states more fully in his *Mental Science*. It is that all objectivity implies the subject-mind at the same time. "All objective states are in a sense also mental." Unless the mind is present, though unconscious, you cannot have object knowledge at all. We cannot have a pure objective condition at all without the subject, supporting it as it were, though for the time being, it is non-apparent, is entirely blotted out. (*Sunyam*) Or rather shall we say, though dissimilar the mind has become thoroughly identified with matter. But mind can ascend to pure subjectivity and it does not imply the presence of objects, as the object does the subject; and in such a pure subjective state, where is the object? It has become also non-apparent (*Sunyam*). Regarding the possibility however of matter being the primary element, there is the fact, matter is found both as organic and inorganic, and what a world of difference is there between these conditions of matter? Is the peculiar organization given to it by the presence for the time being of mind in it or is it derived solely by its inherent power. We have admitted that the so-called dead matter might possess potentialities without number. Still is there any sort of similarity between the inorganic properties exhibited by matter and the organic or vital properties. However this be, we will now proceed to state our analogy. It is the analogy of vowels and consonants. We have quoted the Gita verse, but we look in vain even in Sankara's commentary for the meaning we have tried to give it. Possibly Sankara would not give such an explanation as it would conflict with his preconceived theory. So if there was truth in it, it remained locked and the key altogether remained with the Siddhanta writers. The most familiar example of the analogy occurs in the sacred Kural, in the very first verse of it.

> "அகரமுதலவெழுத்தெல்லா மாதி
> பகவன் முதற்றேயுலகு."
>
> "As 'A' is the first of all letters,
> So the ancient Bagavan is the first in this world."

We might fancy an alphabet, in which the letter "A" is not the first, and if the point of comparison is merely to denote God's order in place as the first, so many other analogies might be thought of. And Parimelalagar accordingly notes that the order is not order in place but order in its origin. It is the most primary and first sound that the human voice can utter, and it is also the one sound which is present in every other sound vowel or consonant. All other vowels are formed by modifications of this sound. And what are vowels and consonants pray? A vowel is defined as a sound that can be pronounced of itself, without the aid of any other sound. And a consonant is one which cannot be sounded except with the aid of the vowel. Let us look more carefully into the nature of these sounds. We every day utter these sounds, and yet we fail to recognize the mystery in their connection, solely on account of their familiarity. We try to utter 'A.' It comes pure and simple, by the mere opening of the mouth, without any modification whatever, and requires no other aid. But let us pronounce say 'K.' It is 'Kê' in English,

in Tamil it is 'Ka' or 'Ik.' There is a vowel sound present in it, 'ê' or 'a' 'i.' Let us eliminate this vowel sound and try to pronounce the consonant. Well, the task is impossible, you don't get any consonant sound at all. In the consonant therefore there is always a vowel sound present, though we never consciously recognize its presence, though in Tamil, the symbolism is so highly philosophical that we invariably mark its presence even when we write purely consonants. We dot all our consonants as 'க்,' 'ச்,' &c. and the dot or circle represents in Hindu symbolism the letter 'அ.' This dot or circle begins almost every one of the twelve vowels in the Tamil alphabet, and as to what the other curved and horizontal and perpendicular lines mean we will take another opportunity to explain. When we write 'க்' therefore, the framers of the alphabet meant to represent how the vowel sound underlies the consonant and supports it and gives it its very being and existence. Such a mark is unnecessary when we write the vowel-consonant 'ka' 'க' as we are fully aware of its presence. In the pure consonant therefore the vowel is implied and understood though for the time being its presence is not detected and it is completely identified with the consonant itself. We have been considering at learned length the nature of the union between mind and body but have we ever paused to consider the nature of the union of the vowel and consonant? Is there any such unique conjunction anywhere else in nature, where one subsists not, except in conjunction with the other. Except the inseparable conjunction, as above stated we see that the consonant (pure) is no more derived from the vowel than the vowel from the consonant. There is much wider contrast between these than between any two things in the world. The place of origin is distinct. 'A' is pronounced by the mere opening of the mouth. The tongue has to be brought in contact with the palate to pronounce 'k' and this same act cannot produce the vowel. So the vowel cannot be said to cause the consonant, nor the consonant the vowel. Nor can we call the consonant and the connection themselves as false and as a mere illusion or delusion. So neither the principle of Parinama nor Vivartana can apply to this connection. All that we can say of it is that they are so connected and inseparable and that no language can be possible, by vowels alone nor by consonants alone, and every consonant is at the same time a vowel-consonant, in which the vowel is apparent or non-apparent, and though we can conceive of the vowels standing alone, to think of consonants as existing by itself is an utter impossibility. Now apply all this to the case of mind and body. Mind is the vowel, and the body (matter) is the consonant. Mind and body are as widely contrasted as vowel and consonants are. One cannot be derived from the other by *Parinama* or *Vivartana*. Yet both are inseparably united and though the mind occupies an independent position, can be pure subject at times, the body cannot subsist unless it be in conjunction with mind. Mind is always implied in body; mind underlies it, supports it and sustains it, (if all this language derived from material cognition is permissible). When the mind is pure mind, the body is not, it is *asat* (*Sunyam*). When it is pure body, mind is present but non-apparent, it has become one with the body. The mind is there but it conceals its very self, its very identity and it is as good as absent. And except at rare intervals, our whole existence is passed in pure objectivity, without recognizing the presence of the true self, the mind. The whole truth of these two analogous, cases, the only two, are brought out in Tamil in the most beautiful manner by the same words being used to denote vowel and consonant as also mind and body. See what a light bursts when we name 'உயிர்,' 'மெய்' (உடல்). The word 'உயிர்' mean both a vowel and mind (soul); and 'மெய்' both body and consonant. Dr. Bain observes that the sense of similarity is the sense of invention and true discovery. The greatest discoveries in science have been made by catching such resemblances at rare intervals. And when the very first Tamil man called his vowels and consonants 'உயிர்' 'மெய்' was he not a born philosopher and had he not comprehended the true nature of the union between mind and body and vowels and consonants. The simile recieves its best exposition for the first time in the hands of Saint Meikanda Deva, (*vide* Sivagnanabotham, II. 1. *b.* and notes pp. 12, 19 and 20), and his followers (*vide* Light of Grace pp. 7 and 8); and Saint Meikandan gives a name in the same verse for denoting this connection. This one word is *Adwaitha*. This word has been a real puzzle to many; and so many renderings of it has been given. The Tamil Philosopher, however, explains it as meaning "ஒன்றாகாமல், இரண்டாகாமல், ஒன்றுமிரண்டு மின்றாகாமல்," (neither one nor two nor neither), and which fully and beautifully brings out, therefore the meaning of Dr. Bain's words that the connection is both a *paradox* and a *contradiction*. Very few outside the circle of

Siddhanta school could be made is to comprehend the truth of this paradox, more so when their mind is prepossessed with the truth of their own views. But we have always used the analogy of vowels and consonants with very great effect, and it has tended to make the subject much clearer than many a more learned argument. We have confined ourself in this article to deal with the last two sets of phenomena in nature, mind and matter and we will reserve to a future article, the nature of the Higher powers, we postulate and their connection with the lower ones; and a further amplification of the subject, together with the history of the question in Indian systems of thought.

THE TAMIL FOUR HUNDRED LYRICS: PURRA-NANNURU.

THE CHIEFTAIN 'STRONGBOW.'

ONE of the seven celebrated generous chieftains of the old Tamil country was Val-vil-ori, or *Athan-ori* ('Strongbow'). His title expresses his special characteristic: he was a Nimrod, 'a mighty hunter.' His hill was *Kolli*, on the Malabar coast—a hill from which the Cera (or Malabar) kings take one of their titles. He was also celebrated for his lavish gifts of richly caparisoned elephants. Three songs are inscribed in his praise (152, 153, 204).

This chief is mentioned in the Pattu-pattu as having fought with another of seven liberal kings, Kari (of whom we shall hear by-and-bye). He is also named in 158, but simply as the 'Lord of the gleaming hill of *Kolli*.'

His especial bard was *Van-Paranar*, whose lyric we translate in a somewhat condensed form. It is doubtless a fair picture of the old Tamil highland chiefs before the Muhammadan invasions.

THE GENEROUS. ARCHER (152.

What artisan thy arrows excellent
Fashioned with many a stroke, O thou, in chase
Victorious ever with thy mighty bow?
Low lay they mighty elephants, and slay
Tigers with wide cavernous jaws,
And spotted antelopes with branching horns!
Before them falls the woodland boar's huge head.
The guano, neighbour of the lowly ant,
They kill. Yet Ori hunts not for mere gain,—
Destroyer mighty though he be; for he
Reigns the right wealthy Lord of *Kolli's* fruitful hill,
Around whose base the mountain streamlets flow,—
Whose mighty breast chaplets of pearl adorn.
O minstrel maid, sing thou a triumph-song!
And ye, bear burthen with your tambourines.
Make ready lute and lyre, tabor and drum,
And every instrument of joyous melody!
Then will we pass from land to land and say,
There is no huntsman like to him; in war
No arm so strong as his to guard and rule—
The lord of *Kolli's* hill, *Ori's* proud height;
The brave one, loved and loving, rich in gifts!

Another bard, whose epithet was 'Owner of the elephant that chews the sugar-cane,' and who is otherwise unknown, has composed an interesting poem in his praise. (204.)

THE SEA AND THE STREAMLET.

'Tis shame to say to wealthy men, 'Give ye';
Sorer disgrace when these say, 'We give not';
To say, 'Take this my gift,' is excellent;
To say, 'I take not,' is more excellent.
Who thirst for water will not stoop to drink
On the sea's marge where sparkling wavelets spread
Of water crystal clear.—Though cows and sheep
Thick thronging make the banks one muddy mass,
And though the streamlet trickles scant and slow,
There's well-trod path to where sweet waters flow!
If thou give not, thy suppliants blame the time,
And inauspicious signs, but blame not thee;
For thou art liberal as the o'er-arching heaven.

This story gives a mere glimpse of the mighty Tamil archer. For twelve centuries it has existed in South India, and has been the source of many legends in other literatures, and is mixed up with traditions of the Pandiyan kings of Madura, who, being supposed to be incarnations of Siva, had the bow and arrows as their special attributes. But all that is received and accredited tradition about *Ori* is contained in these lyrics.

Indian Institute, Oxford. G. U. POPE, M.A., D.D.

EVIDENCES OF NATURAL RELIGION.

The Divine Perfections.

(*Continued from page 259, Vol. I.*)

In the south of Italy, on the shore of the bay of Naples, casting its dim shadow into the azure waves of that enchanted gulf, stands a city about two thousand five hundred years old. It is the historical town of Pompei, only of late years taken out of the grave into which its dangerous neighbour Mount Vesuvius had buried it under a deluge of burning ashes. It is still now a deserted town, silent are its streets, lonely its basilicas, solitary its theatres, empty its houses, void of clients its forum, even many of its tombs are empty of the mortal remains therein of old interred. Travellers only from all quarters of the world, walk across the silent streets and take their luncheon under the broken arches of the stately temples, of the half-ruined basilicas. But, however deserted, solitary and devoid of inhabitants Pompei may be, you cannot mistake its nature, its origin, its end. It was a town, built for human accomodation, and as such you are sure it did not spring up of itself, but it was the slow work of art and time. Accordingly you inquire about the architects that raised those lofty buildings, the painters that covered with frescos those main walls, the sculptors that enriched those halls and gardens with statues so delicately wrought, the masons, the artificers, whose hands were, so to say, the living origin of the ill fated town. From the mere inspection of its mighty ruins you rightly argue that a host of different artiffcers took part in its building and from their works you qualify the artists, from their works you appreciate their respective style, and give sentence upon their relative worth.

The Universe the great building of God.

Now, this Universe is the house, the palace, the great building of God. No very careful inspection of it is needed to see that its builder, its architect, its Maker must be intelligent, Wise, All-Powerful, Just, Good, Immense, Eternal, Infinite, One. Every created thing asserts with unrivalled eloquence that God the Creator is endowed with all these attributes.

In our last lecture we saw at some length that God our Creator, our Maker is endowed with the attribute of Personality, that He is an Intelligent and Personal God. But we must not stop there. We must go further. We must search more deeply into the attributes of the God-head. Almighty God, it is said, abides in inaccesible light which man's eyes cannot bear, whereto man cannot come up; but we shall ask for divine help, we shall humbly pray to Him to reveal Himself to us, we shall beseech Him to the effect, that we may be admitted to some knowledge of Him, to some friendly intercourse with our Father, our Creator, our God. "The works and the designs of the omnipotent Creator," says Admiral William Henry Smith, "are inscrutable to the most brilliant human intellect, yet enough is revealed, both with regard to the wondrous universe and our own mental capacity, to convince the reflecting mind that it is a mark of devotion which we owe to our Maker to study with earnestness those beautiful and harmonious works around us, however their immensity may at first bewilder us. He who zealously applies himself will verify the sacred promise. "Those who seek shall find."

Let us therefore apply ourselves to seek with earnestness what God is, in the hope that we shall attain to some knowledge of his divine nature.

God's nature or Essence.

God's nature or essence may be briefly described as follows: There is one self-existent living and true God, Creator of heaven and earth, Omnipotent, eternal, immense, incomprehensible, infinite in intellect in will and in all perfection, who being One, separate, absolutely simple and unchangeable spiritual substance or person, is to be regarded as distinct really and in essence from the world, most blessed in and from Himself and unspeakably elevated above all things that exist, or can be conceived except Himself! (Denz. 1631. The Decree of the Vatican Council of 1870).

To proceed with some order we shall begin by showing that God is the only self-existent or necessary Being, as this attribute is so to say the fruitful source whence the rest necessarily flow, and embraces in its comprehensiveness the nature or essence of God.

God self-existent.

In the probable year of the world 2513, and 1491 years before Christ, God appeared to to Moses the great prophet of the Jewish people, and commanded him to go forth and deliver the children of Israel out of the hands of the Egyptians who held them under the most degrading and tyrannous bondage. Moses accepted the perilous mission, but he asked of God one thing only. Moses knew too well, that, the divine Being he was speaking to, was the God of his fathers, the God of Abraham of Issac, of Jacob, but he wanted to know something more about his nature, about his characteristic attributes, and accordingly he ventured to ask of God His name. And Moses said to God:

"Lo! I shall go to the children of Israel, and say to them: The God of your fathers hath sent me to you. If they should say to me "What is His name? What shall I say to them?" Now let us hear the divine answer! God said to Moses: "I am who am" God said: Thus

thou shalt say to the children of Israel: He who is, hath sent me to you": Exodus. ch. III. 13. 14—God therefore is He who is, that is, He is that only person to whom existence is nature, who owes his own existence to none, who is uncreated, unborn, eternal, self-existent, independent, infinite, without beginning, end or change, the first Being, the only necessary Being, the primary cause and the source of all other things. Good heavens! how this idea of God's nature raises him in our eyes above every conceivable thing! Before we were born, before the forefathers of the Hindus crossed the sapta-sindu, before the creation of man, before the combining of earthly elements, before the shaping and moulding of the primeval chaos, before the time when heaven and earth sprang into existence out of nothing at God's command, God existed, most blessed in Himself and from Himself, eternal, infinite, unchangeable and such as he even exists in this moment of time. Why so? Because God owes his existence to none: but He is the only self-existent, the only necessary Being; that is, so He exists that he cannot but exist, as he possesses in Himself the necessity of his existence. Who can grasp adequatly this infinitely comprehensive idea? Who can fathom this abyss? If we look around us, we find no creature in the Universe but finite, but contingent, namely which so exists as not exclude the possibility of not existing, and which actually once did not exist. Self existense is the absolute characteristic of the First Cause. God exists really, and creatures also exist really; God is, and the creature also is. Yet the divine Being and the created being differ infinitely from one another, in that the former is independent, the latter dependent; the former uncaused, and the latter caused; the former has all things of itself and the latter has absolutely nothing of itself, but is itself an effect produced out of nothing according to a preconceived idea derived from the Divine essence. This infinite difference is indicated by saying that, God not only is, but is of Himself in virtue of his own essence; in a word; He is self-existent. (1) c. f. B. Boedder. S. Y. Natural Theology. page 331.

Indeed, everything that can be and not be, that is, which so exists as not to exclude the possibility of not existing, is contingent, namely it does not exist of absolute necessity, but has a cause of its existence and depends for its existence on a cause outside itself, because whatever does not exist of absolute necessity and in virtue of its own essence, is, in itself, indifferent to being or not being, and is in consequence indebted for its actual existence to a cause or agent outside itself. But in this case the agent or efficient cause to which it owes its existence is prior to itself, as the efficient cause is always, some way or other, prior to its effect. Thus a house for instance, is of itself, indifferent either to being or not being, namely it exists so as not to exclude the possibility of not existing, and as it was reared on its gor..und, it might also not have been reared, and consequently, its existence is limited, finite, caused or contingent.

But if it be so, the efficient cause of the house or the architect must be prior to the house itself, as the first condition of a cause is its priority in regard to the effect.

G. Bartoli, s. j., d. d.

(*To be continued.*)

KAMBAN.

(*Continued from page 262, Vol. I.*)

Pugazhendi was fully aware of the first rate intellectual powers of Kamban and respected him as his superior. Pugazhendi was like Cowper and Goldsmith a homely poet. Kamban was Miltonic in diction and delineation and was Shakespearian in thought. He would have been a Homer if he had lived in earlier days Otta was only a star of the first magnitude before the other two luminaries. He was in fact a Southey with vast labour and erudition but little endowed with poetic genius of a very high order. He was, however, not a scholar and poet of a very ordinary type. But the brilliancy and grandeur of the others hid his diminished head. The genius of these poets moved in special grooves. *Venba* was the favorite metre of புகழேந்தி. Otta was dexterous in composing கோவை, உலா and அந்தாதி. Kamban soared while chanting in விருத்தம்.

The probable Literature available to and availed of by Kamban:—Before proceeding to analyse the genius of Kamban, let us take a rough glance of the literature that was available to him, and see what part of that literature shaped his genius and how far he was indebted to his predecessors. We have already seen that he lived in the 11 century. It is plain, therefore, that all literature then extant was before him. The பத்துப்பாட்டு, எட்டுத்தொகை and பதினெண் கீழ்க்கணக்கு பாரதவெண்பா and தகடூர் யாத்திரை and முத்தொள்ளாயிரம் and other works and commentaries of the last Madura College were available. He might have read all or at least some of the Major Five Epics and the Minor Five Epics. The தேவாரம் of சம்பந்தர், அப்பர் and சுந்தரர், and the திருவாசகம் and திருக்கோவையார் of மாணிக்கவாசகர், the பெரியபுராணம் of அருண்மொழித்தேவர், and the ஸ்காந்த புராணம் of கச்சியப்பசிவாசாரியார் and other important works of the Saivas were ready to his hand. திரு

மங்கையாழ்வார் being the contemporary of சம்பந்தர், and being also the last of the twelve ஆழ்வார், the whole of நாலாயிரப்பிரபந்தம் he could have perused. There was the great grammar தொல்காப்பியம் with its commentaries of இளம்பூரணர், பேராசிரியர் and கல்லாடர். We are not sure whether சேனாவரையம் had its birth as yet. There was இறையனாரகப்பொருள் and நக்கீரர்'s commentary thereon. There was also the வீரசோழியம் of Buthamithiranar, and யாப்பருங்கலம் and காரிகை with their commentaries. We are not in a position to affirm who the commentator of திருக்கோவையார் is and so we cannot state whether the commentary on it was in the time of Kamban. The commentators of நாலாயிரப்பிரபந்தம் were all in and after the time of Ramanuja, whom we have already seen coming after Kamban. From a reference to ஆளவந்தபிள்ளையாசிரியர் (*i. e.*, ஆளவந்தார் or யமுனைத்துறைவர்) in the commentary of மலைபடுகடாம், it is apparent that நச்சினார்க்கினியர் lived after ஆளவந்தார் *i. e.* in the 13th century. Hence it follows that நச்சினார்க்கினியர் lived at least about two centuries after Kamban and that, therefore, the commentaries of நச்சினார்க்கினியர் and பரிமேலழகர் (contemporary of நச்சினார்க்கினியர்) were not seen by Kamban. The commentator of சிலப்பதிகாரம், *viz.*, அடியார்க்குநல்லார் evidently criticizes நச்சினார்க்கினியர் about the antiquity of காப்பியம் in Tamil in the opening lines of his commentary, and therefore should have lived after நச்சினார்க்கினியர். There is a difficulty about நச்சினார்க்கினியர். Scholars believe that he should have lived prior to Kamban and Kachiyappa, as he has not in his voluminous commentaries made any reference whatever to these very famous authors, and has not made any quotation from their works in illustration of any grammatical or literary point. Mr. C. W. Damodaram Pillai believes (page 22 preface to கலித்தொகை) that Nachinarkiniyar lived about 1,200 years ago as he belonged to the times of the Shamanals. We are of opinion that Nachinarkiniyar from the tone of his commentaries seems to have had reverence only for the works of the Madura College and those of some authors immediately following such as Manickavasagar; and that object was to commentate upon works which were being neglected on account of their difficulty and to adopt them to the rules of the only comprehensive grammar தொல்காப்பியம். His object in commentating upon தொல்காப்பியம் too might have been to further the utility of the work and to throw light upon the many inexplicable passages of the works of the Madura College. So cared not to quote from the authors Kamban and the others who were his immediate predecessors. From such evidence before us we are led to think that Kamban read barely the text of his favorite Kural or some one or more of the other eight commentaries on Kural which was or were available to him. We have thus roughly noted what works might have been and what might not have been available to Kamban.

But to state exactly the works he might have perused with interest and the works which shaped his genius is not an ordinary affair. This requires a very careful study of the whole Ramayan and various other works of its kind which existed before Kamban, and a very careful collateral comparison of the thoughts and language of the different poets with Kamban. This is not a task which can be performed in a few days or weeks or months, only years of patient study will settle this most knotty question. We confess we have not devoted any part of the limited time at our disposal in studying this most difficult and yet interesting question. We have been able to gather some points during our leisure moments, and these we will specify here. Tradition says that when the Tamil Ramayan was subject to the approval of the learned assembly, some of the hearer asked the author how he was able to bring in so many fine thoughts in his work, and that the author said " I took a ladle from each of the epics சிந்தாமணி, சிலப்பதிகாரம், மணிமேகலை &c. &c. The following stanza is attributed to அம்பிகாபதி the son of Kamban.

> காதன் மடந்தயர் கையறுங்காலையு மெய்யகலா
> போதகுநாணு மெலியவன்றோ விழிபோலு நெய்தற்
> போதவிழ்மென்மலர்ப் புன்னையஞ்சான்ல் பொருந்து மிந்த
> மாதவிபெற்றமணிமேகலை நம்மைவாழ்விப்பதே.

Ambigapathy was sentenced to death while Kamban was yet alive. The above stanza is in praise of மணிமேகலை. There is no doubt that the father also was familiar with the work whose praise was sung by the son. His contemporary Pugazhendi is said to have made a popular metrical paraphrase (to be read to or by females) of சிலப்பதிகாரம் under the name of கோவலன்கதை, of course varying the plot as best suited his age and hearers and readers. If this paraphrase which is to hand now is really from Pugazhendi there is no doubt that சிலப்பதிகாரம் was a popular work in the time of Kamban. From a

perusal of சூளாமணி we find that Kamban had either no acquaintance with it or did not borrow anything from it. From this we conjecture he had not much to do with its sister minor epics.

The 15th stanza of நாட்டுப்படலம் of பெரியபுராணம்.

" கரும்பல்ல செல்லென்கை சமுகல்ல கரும்பென்னச்
சுரும்பல்ல குடைநீலத் துகளல்ல பகலெல்லாம்
அரும்பல்ல முலையென்ன அமுதல்ல மொழியென்ன

seems to have suggested the 47th stanza of நாட்டுப்படலம் of Ramayan

" நெல்மலை யல்லன நிரைவரு தரளம்
சோன்மலை யல்லன தோடுகட லமுதம்
நன்மலை யல்லன நதிதரு நிதியம்
பொன்மலை யல்லன மணிபடு புளினம்

and again the 17th stanza of the former "காடெல்லாங் கழைக்கரும்பு...நலமெல்லாம்" might have given rise to the 2nd stanza of நாட்டுப்படலம் of Ramayan

"வரம்பெலா முத்தந்தத்து மடையெலாம் &c.," The style of பெரியபுராணம் is like the smooth flow of a gentle river while such is not the case with the Ramayan.

The 17th stanza of ஆற்றுப்படலம் of the Ramayan.

" முல்லையை...செல்லுறு கதியிற் செல்லும்
வினையெனச் சென்ற தன்றே

reminds us of 31st stanza of ஆற்றுப்படலம் of ஸ்காந்தம்—

பாலிடை...அந்தத் தாருயி ரனைத்துந்
தத்த மருவினைக் கமைந்த நீராற்
சேருறு கதிக ளென்ன &c.,

The 6th stanza of ஆற்றுப்படலம் of Ramayan.

" தலையு மாகமுந் தாளுந் தழீஇயதன்
நிலை நிலாதிறை நின்றது போலவே.
விலையின் மாதரை யொத்ததவ் வெள்ளமே,

seems to be an improvement on the 32nd stanza of ஆற்றுப்படலம் of ஸ்காந்தம்.

" கால்கிளர் கின்றநீத்தம்...மால்கிளர்
கணிகை மாதர் மனமேனப் போயிற்றமால்.

The last two lines of the 6th stanza of திருநகரப்படலம் ஸ்காந்தம்

இப்படி...அப்பதியே யதனுக்கிணை
யன்றிச் செப்பரிதாற்பிரசீர் கெழகாஞ்சி

might have been adopted in 3rd stanza of நகரப்படலம் of Ramayan.

"உமைக்கொரு...இது வலாதிதனுக்
கியம்பலா முவமைமற் றியாதோ"

The 7th of அரசியல் in Ramayan.

நேமி மால்வரை மலையாக &c. "recalls to mind நிறையும் வார்கடல் சுற்றிய நேமியும் &c." 14-திருநகரம்-Scandam. A careful examination of Scanda convinces us

that Kamban had a thorough familiarity with the work though he has not borrowed either the diction or sentiments of Kachiyappa. Though these two poets come near each other in many respects, there is no denying the fact that the language of Kachiyappa is more polished than that of Kamban, Kachiyappa does not seem to be beaten down by Kamban; on the other hand, he rather seems to have been an indirect tutor of the latter.

Let us now see whether Kamban has anything from Chintamani. In the 33rd stanza (Bower's Edition) the clouds poured down like rods of silver on the mountain. In the 4th stanza நாட்டுப்படலம் of Ramayan, the clouds poured down as it were rods of silver in order to adorn the mountain top which was a bare sheet of gold. In the 51st stanza Chintamani has

கண்ணெனக் குவளையுங் கட்ட லோம்பினர்
வண்ணவாண் முகமென மரையி னுள்புகார்.

The same thought is better handled in the 10th of the same padalam of Ramayan

பண்கள்வாய் மிழற்றுமின்சொற் கடைசியர் பரந்துநீண்ட
கண்கைகால் முகம்வாய்ஒக்குங் களையலாற் களையிலாமை
உண்கள்வார் கடைவாய்மள்ளர் களைகலா துலாவிநிற்பார்.

The last line of the 98th stanza of Chintamani

மட்டவர் தப்பலிற் பரவையேந் தல்குல்
அட்டொளி யரத்தலாய்க் கணிகை யல்லது
மட்டுடை மணமகள் மலர்ந்த போதினுல்
கட்டுடைக் காவலிற் காமர் கன்னியே.

is borrowed in the 14th நகரப்படலம் of Ramayan "அன்னமா...........அகழி, பொன்விலைமகளிர் மனமெனக் கீழ்போய்ப் புன்கவியெனத் தெளிவின்றிக், கன்னியால் துற்றடமென யார்க்கும்படி வருங்காப்பினதாகி &c." The style of Chintamani is not so strong as the Ramayan but the genius of the First Tamil Epic poet in the Sanskrit mode is in no way inferior to that of Kamban "The Tamil Ramayan," says Caldwell, is undoubtebly a great poem, and in this department of composition the Chintamani alone can dispute with it for the paln of supremacy."

We will now see how much he owes to the Kural of திருவள்ளுவர்.

1. "தங்கள் நாயகரிற் றெய்வம் தவம் பிறவிலவென் றெண்ணும்" (16 வேள்விப்படலம்) is evidently the purport of "தெய்வந்தொழாள் &c." (5, VI).

2. "வெள்ளியையாதல் &c. இன்னுயிரேனும், கொள்ளுதல்தீது கொடுப்பதுநன்றுல்" (29, வேள்வி) is parallel to "நல்லாறெனினும் கொளல்தீது மேலுலக மில்லெனினு யீதலே நன்று" (2, XXIII).

3. "புக்குநின்று தன் &c. ஊழ்முறையல்லது வலிய தொன்றில்லென வுணர்வுற்முன் (215, ஊர்தேடுபடலம்) is from ஊழிற்பெருவலியாவுள &c" (10 XXXVIII).

4. முன்பிற் சிறந்தாரிடை &c. என்பிற் சிறந்தாயா தொருற்றமுண்டென்ன லாமோ, அன்பிற்சிறந்தாயதொா பூசனை யார்கணுண்டே (61, கடறுவுபடலம் (the minds of us அன்புடையாரென்பு முரியர் பிறர்க்கு (2, VIII).

5. உதவாமலொருவன்செய்த உதவிக்குக் கைம்மாருக மதயானை யனையமைந்த மற்றுமுண்டாகவற்றே &c (66, கிட்கிந்தைப்படலம்) is no other than செய்யாமற் செய்த உதவிக்கு வையகமும் வானகமு மாற்றலரிது.

6. "சிதைவகல் காதற்றுயை &c உதவிகொள் யார்க்கென்றேனு மொழிகலாமுபாயமுண்டோ" (62, கிட்கிந்தைப் படலம்) is undoubtedly from எந்நன்றிகொன்றார்க்கு முய்வுண்டா.

7. ஊருணி நிறையவுமுதவு மாடுயர்பார் கெழுபழுமறம் பழுத்தற்றுகவும் (82 மந்திரப்படலம்) is an adpatation of ஊருணிநீர்நிறைந்தற்றே &c & பயன்மகமுள்ளார் பழுத்தற்றால் &c 5 & 6 XXII).

8. எலியெலாமிப்படை அரவம்யானென (10 குகப்படலம்) seems to be borrowed from ஒலித்தக்கா………… எலிப்பகை நாகமுயிர்ப்பக்கெடும் (3 LXXVII).

9. "வன்றெறு ……….ஒன்றுரைத் துயிரினும் ஒழுக்கம் நன்றென &c" (24 கிளைகண்டு நீங்குதல்) is an echo of ஒழுக்கம் விழுப்பந்தரலாலே ஒழுக்கமுயிரினு மோம்பப்படும் (I XIV.)

10. "வேண்டின வேண்டினர்க்களிக்கு மெய்த்தவம்" (8 அகத்தியப்படலம்) is only வேண்டிய வேண்டியாங்கெய்தலாற்செய்தவமீண்டுமுயலப்படும் (5 XXVII).

11. "உயர்ந்தவர்க்குதவிய வுதவியொப்பவே" (34 வேள்வி) is from "உதவி……..உதவிசெய்யப்பட்டார் சால்பின்வரைத்து" (5. XI.)

12. மானநோக்கிற் கவரிமாவனைய நீரார் is in other words மயிர்நீப்பின்வாழாக் கவரிமாவன்ன ருயிர்நீப்பர் மானம் வரின் (9, XCVII).

The author who borrowed the sentiments and the language of திருவள்ளுவர் must be supposed to have drawn a good deal from the same author in his dileneation of the ministers of Dasaratha, stanzas 6 to 10 மந்திரப்படலம். We have carefully read the ten chapters on ministers by திருவள்ளுவர். Kamban enumerates about a score of qualifications. In his fine stanzas of four lines each, *i. e*, in 20 lines he has said more than what திருவள்ளுவர் has said in his 100 couplets *i. e.*, 200 lines. And it should be borne in mind that திருவள்ளுவர் makes a regular code of the requirements of ministers while Kamban only describes the qualifications possessed by Dasaratha's ministers. The reader, however, seems to know a minister better from the description than from the code. Kamban has actually borrowed some sentiments here from திருவள்ளுவர் and yet he excels his master. Kamban's actual observation in the royal court has given him a better idea of a minister.

From the above examination, we find that the passages referred to are not so much borrowed (except in the case of Kural) as are bettered. They seem rather parallels than imitations. Even where he seems to borrow, the thought is couched in such improved garbage that his sentiment and language seem rather to be originals than plagiarisms. But there can be no doubt that he studied very carefully Skanda and Chintamani as far as we are able to judge. In the abundance and fertility of his genius his plagiarisms and borrowed sentiments seem like trinkets and trifles borrowed by a rich man from his neighbours for a grand feast or entertainment.

Tamil Poetry :—Before entering into an examination of the salient features of Kamban's Ramayan which is a standing monument of the greatness of the poet and his genius, it is indispensable to have an idea of the main characteristics of Tamil poetry. The great grammarian Tholkappyan only analyses the mechanism of poetry but does not make any definite statement of the nature of poetry, எழுத்து முதலா வீண்டிய வடியிற், குறித்த பொருளை முடியநாட்டல், யாப்பெனமொழிப யாப் பறிபுலவர். This is what may be taken as a definition of poetry from the great grammarian, Pavananthy, a grammarian of logical accuracy only defines and explains poetry by a comparison. The human body is a mechanism of various elements accomodating life: so is poetry an embellished composition of words embodying (பொருள்) matter. In this comparison, Pavananthy at least seems to hint that unless there is life in it a poem rarely deserves the name. The goal of all knowledge, the Tamils say is salvation—the attainment of Heavenly bliss. This inconceivable and inexplicable bliss requires three necessary preliminaries, viz., duty (அறம்), wealth (பொருள்) and worldly enjoyment (இன்பம்). A discourse, therefore, on these three items, should be the object of literary works. This is the chief end in view especially of the epic.

T. CHELVAKESAVARAYA MUDALIAR, M A.

(*To be continued*).

REVIEWS.

THE VIVEKACHINTAMANI SERIES.

Life of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, Empress of India.*

We do not know if Englishmen fairly realize how vast a hold Her Most Gracious Majesty has acquired in the hearts of the Indian People. In one respect indeed they go much further than the British people in the veneration of their Beloved Empress. They are so prone to Heroworship, and so imaginative, that they think, in the words of His Holiness Sri Sankaracharia Swamigal of Sringeri, that "so many good qualities would not concentrate in one woman unless she be an incarnation of the Great Almighty." Her life of genuine sympathy and love, true modesty and purity, real nobility and greatness will always be a beacon light for generations untold. And though there are two are there lives in Tamil already of Her Majesty, yet we welcome this new Life from our friend Mr. C. V. Swaminathier's hands as it is in no way superfluous. The Life also contains an useful appendix describing the constitution of the Government of India and of the India Office, London. We have already spoken of the great work Mr. C. V. S. is doing and we earnestly hope that such work will duly be crowned with greater and greater success.

THE STORY OF THE LIFE OF BUDDHA.†

It was purely through historical circumstances and from the nature of the travestied Buddhist propaganda after the time of Buddha and from its pronounced antagonism to Hinduism that the prejudice has long lingered in the Tamil land against Buddha and it is time therefore that the Tamil people understand the true greatness of Lord Gautama Buddha and as such we give a hearty welcome to the volume before us. As we have elsewhere remarked, he was a Hindu of Hindus himself and the best and noblest of them. He preached a simple and pure life, shorn of all hypocrisy and deceit and ostentation, and such a life has always been the ideal of the devout Hindu. The mischief, however, is in its one-sidedness, and even those of to-day who wish to emulate him, would hardly keep themselves aloof from dogmatic Buddhism.

* C. V. Swaminathier. D. K. Agency, Madras, 1898. 293 p. Full cloth. Ornamental sides, gilt back, Price Rs. 1—4—0

† (Same Series, Price 14 annas).

THE VIVEKA MANJARI.*

We owe an apology for not noticing this miscellany earlier to the Secretary of the D. K. Agency. The volume is tastefully got up and we have already noticed the first two stories. The Life of Sivaji is new and it contains very many valuable lessons. The author does full justice to the greatness of this Indian Hero, though he, in no way, conceals his blemishes About his time was established the Mahratha Dynasty in South India, and their rule was always popular. As the heavens have willed it, a nobler and superior rule has been set up in the land and we have no cause to regret it. We know the Secretary was delaying the publication of the book owing to current events in the Western Presidency. And it is only to be hoped that no sinister meanings be ascribed to books of this sort.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

OURSELVES.—With the aid of God's grace, we have been able to bring the past year to a successful termination. When we proposed the undertaking, more difficulties were suggested to us than encouragement, and now, though we have had to contend with difficulties, we are glad to say we have got on. The success is due to a great extent by the generous support of the public, and to the kind help of several friends in South India and Ceylon. We take this opportunity of thanking our contributors, who amidst their own onerous duties and avocations, have been good enough to devote a portion of their time in the service of their country and their God.

***

WE beg to thank the Rev. Dr. Pope, also for the very great interest he evinces in the cause of Tamil and the Tamil people and for the special interest he evinces in the cause of our Magazine. By the last Mail, he kindly sent us several reprints of several of his contributions to the *Asiatic Quarterly Review*, and which have already appeared in these pages. He has also sent us the History of Mânikka Vâchagar, the paper that was read before the Victoria Institute, with a very kind letter, which we take the liberty to publish.

* Containing the story of Colbert (1), Fairy tell-ture (2) and Life of Sivaji (3).

The Rev. Dr. Pope writes as follows:—

Indian Institute,
OXFORD,
28th May 1898.

"It is some time since I wrote to you or heard from you, but we have neither of us I fancy been idle. We are both working for Tamil and the Tamil people. I have sent you a series of papers published in the *Asiatic Quarterly*. You can use these as you like, and if you can suggest any works that should be included in my sketch, I will try to include them.

I have also sent you the life of Mânika Vàchagar with notes. These notes contain the summary of reading carried on for about fifteen years. These notes may be of some use, but of course you know more of these things than I do.

I have also sent you a piece or two from the Pura-Nânûnûru. This very fine work I have finished, and translated all that seemed to me of any real value. I have also finished and sent to the Royal Asiatic Society a summary of the Purra-Porul-Venba. I have nearly finished the Pattu-pattu. I am still in want a good edition of Aingkurrunurru, and Pathittu-Pattu, Paripadal, and Aganamurru. If these are published I must have them.—I think I have got all else that I am ever likely to use. I think I prefer the old edition of the Siddhanta works to the new. I am beginning to get despairing about the publication of my edition of the Tiruvachakam. I have revised and re-revised, and annotated from a variety of sources these remarkable lyrics, and with lexicon, concordance, translation, notes &c, all is ready and type-written.

You were good enough to send me an edition, which I very much value, by unknown editors. It only says 'some learned men.' I find that my own rendering *in almost every case* coincides with theirs. In some cases I have been able to set myself right. In one or two *I think they are wrong.*' I would ask them carefully to reconsider the printing of the text which should be divided, I certainly think into metrical feet. And I am quite persuaded that *there are errors in the text*, which an attention to metre might set right. They are not certainly of any great importance. I note in குயிற்பத்து number 18, line 2, read

பாதம் இரண்டும் வினவிற்
பாதலம் எழினுக் கப்பால்

By all means let us have a carefully edited text."

And it grieves us sorely to say that the Rev. Doctor's call for help for the publication of our Beloved Tamil Upanishad should not have commanded a ready response. It is not a very great matter if only our South Indian Zemindars and Matadhipaties would think of doing their duty. If their devotion to Sri Manikka Vachakar and his sacred lyrics is not mere lip-deep, the publication would have been already an accomplished fact. We will once more appeal to their sense of patriotism to come forward and help the undertaking.

***

The Rev. Father Bartoli is another of our contributors, for whom we have to be very thankful. His lectures are very learned and suggestive, and liberal, and we are glad to say, we agree with him in the main. If his remarks about Idolatry had been somewhat distasteful to some of our readers, we have only to assure them that the Rev. Father does not mean any offence and his remarks are couched in the best of spirit. Here are his own words, "In future I promise you I shall altogether abstain from the obnoxious word Idolaters, which displeases your kind readers. However as I have told you in one of my letters (He signifies his agreement with us with regard to symbolism) I am fully convinced that educated Brahmins or Hindus generally cannot be called idolaters because they are not so. But what of the common people? Learned Brahmins testified to me that when the ignorant crowd venerate their idols, they really believe that the deity himself, or a particular God lives and resides in that block of stone or wood. At any rate let it be what it may. If this is not true, so much the better, and I thank God for it."

***

"Talking of devotion, he (Dr. Johnson) said, 'though it be true that 'God dwelleth not in temples made with hand,' yet in this state of being, our minds are more piously affected in places appropriated to divine worship, than in others. Some people have a particular room in their houses where they say their prayers; of which I do not disapprove, as it may animate their devotion."*Boswell*

Perhaps this latter custom has fallen into desuctude in England, in these days of extreme civilization, even among the minority, but the '*Puja room*' is a common feature in every Hindu household, even in Bungalows built up and furnished according to the latest fashion.

***

The 13th anniversary of the Trichinopoly Saiva Siddantha Sabha was celebrated on 19th and 20th of this month. The boys of the Sabha's Sunday School were awarded prizes on the first day. Pandit S. Saravana Pillai of Salem lectured to very select audiences on both days, on topics, in which he may truly claim to have received new light namely the "Relation of the Mathematical Sciences to Hindu Metaphysics." Srila Sri S. Somasundara Nayagar was unable to attend, owing to delicate health and his absence was very much regretted.

MADRAS:—Printed by P. C. KALLIANA SUNDARA NADAR, at the C. N. PRESS, and Published by J. M. NAGARATHNAM.